

The JOURNAL of
SOUTHERN
HISTORY

VOL. IV

AUGUST, 1938

No. 3



Published quarterly by the
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME IV

AUGUST, 1938

NUMBER 3

Published Quarterly by

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION



BOARD OF EDITORS

RICHARD H. SHRYOCK
Duke University

JOHN D. BARNHART
Louisiana State University

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL
University of Texas

AVERY O. CRAVEN
University of Chicago

CHARLES S. SYDNOR
Duke University

WILLIAM O. LYNCH
Indiana University

PHILIP DAVIDSON
Agnes Scott College

FRANK L. OWSLEY
Vanderbilt University

MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

GUARANTOR

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

President—PHILIP M. HAMER, The National Archives

Vice-President—CHARLES S. SYDNOR, Duke University

Secretary-Treasurer—FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina



Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

CONTENTS

<i>Zachary Taylor as President.</i> By William O. Lynch.....	279
<i>The Rift in Virginia Democracy in 1896.</i> By Allen Moger.....	295
<i>Disfranchisement of the Negro in Mississippi.</i> By William Alexander Mabry.....	318
<i>The Jefferson Birthday Dinner, 1830.</i> By Richard R. Stenberg.....	334
<i>Unionist Sentiment in South Carolina in 1860.</i> By Lillian A. Kibler....	346
<i>Notes and Documents</i>	
King's Mountain: Letters of Colonel Isaac Shelby. Edited by J. G. deRoulhac Hamilton.....	367
Arkansas Traveler, 1852-1853: Diary of John W. Brown. Edited by Horace Adams.....	377
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Kraus, <i>A History of American History</i> , by John D. Barnhart.....	384
Harriss, <i>Lawson's History of North Carolina</i> , by Hugh T. Lefler.....	385
Williams, <i>Dawn of Tennessee Valley and Tennessee History</i> , by Stanley J. Folmsbee.....	387
Hill, <i>George Mason, Constitutionalist</i> , by Thomas Perkins Abernethy.....	388
Seeber, <i>Anti-Slavery Opinion in France during the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century</i> , by Lynn M. Case.....	390
Jackson, <i>Uncommon Scold: The Story of Anne Royall</i> , by Culver H. Smith...	391
Foreman, <i>Adventure on Red River; Report on the Exploration of the Headwaters of the Red River</i> , by John C. L. Andreassen.....	392
Enmale, <i>The Civil War in the United States</i> , by Edwin B. Coddington.....	393
Cate, <i>Two Soldiers: The Campaign Diaries of Thomas J. Key, C. S. A., Dec. 7, 1863-May 17, 1865, and Robert J. Campbell, U. S. A., Jan. 1, 1864-July 21, 1864</i> , by Frank L. Owsley.....	394
LeConte, <i>'Ware Sherman, A Journal of Three Months' Personal Experience in the Last Days of the Confederacy</i> , by Charles R. Wilson.....	396
Patton, <i>Minutes of the Proceedings of the Greenville Ladies' Association in Aid of the Volunteers of the Confederate Army</i> , by Rosser H. Taylor...	397
Hertz, <i>The Hidden Lincoln, From the Letters and Papers of William H. Herndon</i> , by Albert V. House, Jr.....	398
Trexler, <i>The Confederate Ironclad "Virginia" ("Merrimac")</i> , by Frank L. Owsley.....	401
Wesley, <i>The Collapse of the Confederacy</i> , by Thomas Robson Hay.....	402
Henry, <i>The Story of Reconstruction</i> , by E. Merton Coulter.....	404
Brawley, <i>Negro Builders and Heroes</i> , by B. I. Wiley.....	405
Jefferson, <i>The Old Negro and the New Negro</i> , by B. I. Wiley.....	406
Gailor, <i>Some Memories</i> , by L. B. Shippee.....	407
<i>Communications</i>	409
<i>Historical News and Notices</i>	411
Personal.....	411
Historical Societies.....	413
Bibliographical.....	415
<i>Contributors</i>	422

Zachary Taylor as President

By WILLIAM O. LYNCH

"Old Rough and Ready," Zachary Taylor, soldier and president, played quite a part in his time. As a general in the Mexican War his record is familiar, and his fame as a military man has stood the test. On the other hand, not much is known of him during his sixteen months as president of the United States. The crisis of 1850 has naturally loomed large in the eyes of those who have written the history of the period, and, in that crisis, other leaders overshadowed President Taylor. Very conspicuous throughout the campaign year of 1848, the fates assigned to the General but a minor rôle after his inauguration on March 5, 1849.

Leaders of both major parties felt the necessity of holding their lines alike in North and South. The Democratic party championed the annexation of Texas and the Mexican War. It thus acquired a reputation as a proslavery party. Northern Whigs lost no opportunity to enhance and perpetuate this reputation, at the same time endeavoring to get credit for themselves as an antislavery party. With General Taylor as a candidate the situation was changed. Even Northern Whigs could no longer make headway by attacking the Democratic party for the Mexican War policy. All through the Southern states, the General was presented to the voters as the friend of the South. In the North, Whig editors and campaign orators continued to argue that theirs was a free soil party, and that there was no occasion for any antislavery Whig to vote for Martin Van Buren, candidate of the Free Soilers. Leaders of the future Republican party, including Seward, Greeley, and Lincoln,

maintained this position, declaring that General Taylor, if elected, would not veto a Wilmot Proviso measure.¹

There was justification for the positions taken by both Northern and Southern Whigs. General Taylor was a strong Union man, and for that reason was deeply alarmed over the agitation of the slavery question. He adopted the view that Congress should legislate which probably did mean that he would not veto a bill prohibiting slavery in a territory.² He was, however, no advocate of such a policy either before or after he became president. It is true that he was hostile to Southern disunionists, but he was also an enemy of Northern agitators. In a letter of August, 1847, he no doubt expressed his honest convictions:

While I would on the slavery question, respect the opinions and feelings of the North and be careful not to do any act which would interfere with legal rights as regards the same, I would be equally careful that no encroachments were made on the rights of the citizens of the slaveholding states as regards that description of property or anything else. . . .

Slavery agitation only "added fuel to the flames," widening "instead of healing the breach between the parties concerned." General Taylor selected the word "concerned" advisedly for he declared:

I will not say interested, for those of the non-slave holding states have no interest in the matter. Let them go on to discuss the institutions of the South without notice as regards the matter in question, without its being noticed, but the moment they go beyond that point where resistance becomes right and proper, let the South act promptly, boldly and decisively with arms in their hands if neces-

¹ Horace Greeley's second appeal to the Whig Free Soilers of Ohio, New York *Tribune*, October 28, 1848; speech of William H. Seward at Boston, Washington *National Intelligencer*, September 28, 1848; letter of Robert C. Schenck of Ohio, *ibid.*, August 2, 1848; speech of Abraham Lincoln, July 27, 1848, in *Congressional Globe*, 30 Cong., 1 Sess., appendix, 1041-43.

² A. T. Burnley to John J. Crittenden, New Orleans, January 12, 1849, Crittenden Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress), XIII. Burnley, reporting an interview with Taylor, wrote: "I am quite certain, if a bill passes Congress with the Wilmot Proviso, during General Taylor's Admin. he will not veto it." On April 23, 1850, Robert Toombs wrote Crittenden that he had talked with General Taylor when he (Toombs) first came to Washington (presumably in December, 1849), and that the President stated that "he *would give* no pledges either way about the proviso," but did give Toombs "*clearly* to understand that if it was passed he would sign it." Crittenden Papers, XIV.

sary, as the Union in that case will be blown to atoms, or will be no longer worth preserving.³

Democrats and Whigs were of about equal strength in the South from 1840 to 1850. In 1848, because their standard-bearer was a Southern military hero, Whigs held the advantage. Notwithstanding the revolt of the Barnburner Democrats in the East and the desertion of many Democrats of the Northwest to the Free Soilers, Lewis Cass was not able to command the full vote of his party in the South. His Nicholson letter, which caused him to be denounced by Northern antislavery men, did not appeal to Southern voters. When they studied the election returns of the South, Northern Democrats were dismayed and angry and soon showed marked antislavery tendencies. The Whig victory was due to increased support in the South, and to the desertion of the Democratic party by the Barnburners of the East.⁴ For a period, many Northern Whigs were strongly influenced to take a more moderate position. The new situation seemed to demand that the Whig party should now play the rôle of a great, nationwide party, "knowing no North and no South." Sensing this, Millard Fillmore made public this postelection opinion:

I regard this election as putting an end to all ideas of disunion. It raises up a national party occupying a middle ground, and leaves the fanatics and disunionists, North and South, without the hope of destroying the fair fabric of our Constitution.⁵

Could General Taylor weld together the elements of the Whig party and build up a strong administration? The selection of a cabinet was his first important task. The man who had done most to bring forward General Taylor and who was his most ardent and effective supporter

³ Taylor to [Jefferson Davis], August 14, 1847, Taylor Papers, 1814-1850 (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

⁴ Taylor carried no Northern state west of Pennsylvania and New York. In both New York and Massachusetts the Free Soil vote was larger than the Democratic vote, giving each of the two states to the Whigs. In New York, the Whig vote was less than 14,000 below that of 1844, whereas the Democratic vote was 123,270 less in 1848 than four years earlier. The electoral vote of Cass and Taylor was exactly the same outside of New York.

⁵ Letter of Millard Fillmore to the *Buffalo Commercial Advertiser*, reprinted in Frank H. Severance (ed.), *Millard Fillmore Papers*, 2 vols. (Buffalo, 1908), II, 286.

during the canvass was Senator John J. Crittenden. The President-elect deeply appreciated this support and was prepared to lean heavily on the Kentucky leader. He was not only anxious to have him in the cabinet, but asked him to choose his own post. An unexpected situation developed in the state convention of the Kentucky Whigs which led to the drafting of Crittenden as a candidate for governor. In the state election of 1848, which occurred in August, he was elected. Having bowed to the wishes of the Whigs of his state, he would not, in March, 1849, leave the governor's chair, which he had occupied but a short time, to go to Washington. This imperiled the success of General Taylor as president to a far greater degree than anyone realized at the time.

Senator John M. Clayton of Delaware had worked hard for Taylor from the first not only in his own state but in Pennsylvania. He was early thought of by the General as a leader who should be offered a place in the cabinet, and, when Taylor found that Crittenden would not change his mind, he settled on Clayton as secretary of state. There was no very wise planning in the selection of the cabinet. General Taylor did not confer personally with Crittenden until he made the journey to Washington and wrote very little to him. He sought counsel from no outstanding leaders of the party. It is especially significant that he in no way approached Clay, Webster, or Seward. He wanted Whigs of high standing personally; industrious men with sound minds, good experience and acknowledged honor. He understood that it was important to go to various parts of the country, and he liked original Taylor men. He did not enjoy the problem, realizing that he knew intimately no one that he had under consideration save Crittenden.⁶ When a Whig who did not vote for Taylor and who knew the Kentucky Governor wrote him that the General was "a perfect novice in politics," he did not exaggerate.

It was on the morning of February 15, 1849, that General Taylor arrived in Frankfort, Kentucky, where he stayed until noon of the next day. He discussed the cabinet freely with Crittenden. Though the General's mind seemed fully made up only in regard to Clayton, one can

⁶ Burnley to Crittenden, New Orleans, January 12, 1849, Crittenden Papers, XIII; A. C. Bullitt to *id.*, New Orleans, December 31, 1848, *ibid.*, XII.

not feel certain that Crittenden exerted much influence. He approved Clayton, and argued strenuously that Robert P. Letcher be made postmaster general.⁷ Letcher was an experienced leader with political wisdom and a rich fund of humor. Going into the presidency without Crittenden, Taylor sorely needed Letcher in the cabinet. By refusing to include him, he missed a chance to avoid at least a part of the unhappiness that was to be his lot while in the White House. Letcher could have supplied something that no member of the cabinet selected was capable of doing. He not only had political sagacity, but he knew men and might have been able to keep the administration on friendly terms with Whigs in Congress. Taylor had earlier announced to someone that if Crittenden should refuse to accept a post, the way would be open to a leader from Ohio or Tennessee. This does not mean that he had personally approached any Whig leader of either of these states, but he considered himself honor bound to live up to his general commitment and would not listen even to Crittenden.⁸

As to the Governor, one admires him for the feeling that he could not desert Kentucky, but his decision was a tragic one for Old Rough and Ready. Remembering that the General might never have become president but for the efforts of Crittenden, it seems necessary to conclude, that, under the circumstances, his responsibility to Taylor, to the Whig party, and to the country as a whole was far greater than his obligation to remain in Kentucky. Many leading Whigs wanted Crittenden to become the head of the new cabinet. His refusal to go to Washington disappointed them and left them doubtful about the future.

In a letter to a friend shortly after he had declared for Taylor in September, 1848, Webster explained that he had asked Whigs to support the candidate, but had flattered neither the General nor his friends. As to the latter, "They," said Webster, "think General Taylor is a miracle of a man, knowing everything without having had an opportunity of learning it, and the fittest man in the world, by a sort of inspiration, to

⁷ Crittenden to John M. Clayton, Frankfort, February 17, 1849, Clayton Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress), III.

⁸ *Ibid.*

administer constitutional government, and discharge the highest civil trusts."⁹ After he became president, Taylor did not seek advice from the great Whig of Massachusetts. In May, 1850, Webster wrote:

I feel neither indifferent, or distant towards our good President. He is an honest man, & a good Whig, & I wish well to his administration, for his sake, & the Country's. But what can I do? He never consults me, nor asks my advice; nor does any one of his Cabinet, except Mr. Meredith. His Cabinet was wholly formed, originally, without asking any opinion of mine, & while some are friendly en^o and others are cross-grained towards me, & excessively jealous. I shall support, cordially, the President's measures whenever I can. . . .¹⁰

Clay met Taylor when he went to New Orleans in January, 1849, but they did not discuss politics or the cabinet.¹¹ Before he left New Orleans, Clay wrote on March 7, 1849: "My relations to the President, on my part, and, as far as I know, on his, are amicable; but I have had no proof of any desire to confer or consult with me on any subject."¹² A few days later, he declared that he was "truly concerned that Letcher was overlooked."¹³ Clay had been very unhappy to see his party nominate General Taylor, and he did absolutely nothing for the hero candidate during the campaign. It is understandable that the General should not wish to consult Clay in regard to the cabinet, but it does seem strange that the administration should have continued to ignore the man who was first in the hearts of so many Whigs. In March, 1850, the great Union-saver could still say: "My relations to the Executive are civil but cold."¹⁴

Soon after Seward came to Washington, a few days before the inauguration, he held interviews with Taylor. His comment relative to the man so soon to occupy the president's chair is informing: "He is a sensi-

⁹ Webster to [R. M.] Blatcheford, Quincy, September 18, 1848, in Fletcher Webster (ed.), *Private Correspondence of Webster* (Boston, 1875), 285-86.

¹⁰ *Id.* to J. Prescott Hall, Washington, May 18, 1850, in Claude H. Van Tyne (ed.), *The Letters of Daniel Webster* (New York, 1902), 412.

¹¹ Burnley to Crittenden, New Orleans, January 12, 1849, Crittenden Papers, XIII.

¹² Clay to General [Leslie] Combs, New Orleans, March 7, 1849, in Calvin Colton (ed.), *The Life and Correspondence and Speeches of Henry Clay*, 6 vols. (New York, 1864), IV, 585-86.

¹³ *Id.* to James Harlan, New Orleans, March 13, 1849, *ibid.*, 586.

¹⁴ *Id.* to *id.*, March 16, 1850, *ibid.*, 603.

ble and sagacious man, but uninformed about men, and will fail to obtain a Cabinet practically strong. It remains to be seen how far honesty and the very purest and most exalted patriotism will cover the defect of political sagacity."¹⁵ It is evident that the new Senator from New York hoped to be consulted in regard to cabinet appointments, but he found that the slate was complete. "Nothing is wanted from me but acquiescence,"¹⁶ he reported to his wife. He was clever enough to swallow his disappointment, and during a month's stay in the Capital, he wisely treated the President kindly and developed friendly relations with the members of the cabinet. After Congress convened in December for the long and memorable session of 1849-1850, Seward kept up his friendly relations with the administration. On December 27, the Senator wrote to Thurlow Weed: "All outsiders come to me, as an organ; and the favor I bear, for being true to the President, will make me an object of hatred."¹⁷ It is not true that Seward was a champion of Taylor's territorial policy, but the President, as he became more and more estranged from other Whig leaders in Congress, was soothed by the friendly treatment accorded by Seward.

That General Taylor ran well in the South, where he was presented to the voters as a Southern leader, is clear when the election returns of 1848 are compared with those of 1844.¹⁸ It was not at all necessary for

¹⁵ Seward to Thurlow Weed, Washington, March 1, 1849, in Frederick W. Seward, *Seward at Washington*, 2 vols. (New York, 1891), II, 101.

¹⁶ *Id.* to his wife, Washington, March 1, 1849, *ibid.*

¹⁷ *Id.* to Weed, Washington, December 27, 1849, *ibid.*, 115.

¹⁸ Popular vote in Southern states, *Whig Almanac*, 1849:

States	—Democratic—		—Whig—	
	1844	1848	1844	1848
Delaware	5,996	5,898	6,278	6,421
Maryland	32,676	34,528	35,934	37,702
Virginia	49,570	46,571	43,667	45,023
North Carolina	39,287	34,869	43,232	43,519
Kentucky	51,988	49,720	61,255	67,141
Tennessee	59,917	58,419	60,030	64,705
Missouri	10,074	40,077	31,250	32,671
South Carolina	(no popular vote)			
Georgia	44,177	44,802	42,100	47,544
Florida	,,	1,847	3,116
Alabama	37,740	31,363	26,034	30,482

him as president to stand with the extremists of the South in order to continue in the good graces of Southern Whig leaders. Had he placed himself in harmony with the Union-savers by a bold declaration that he would support Clay's compromise scheme, he would not have lost his hold on the Whig party in the South. Being a thorough Union man and owing his elevation to the presidency largely to the South, it seems strange that the General did not join the compromisers as a splendid move to strengthen the Union spirit among the Southern Whigs.

In the end, Robert Toombs and Alexander H. Stephens like most of the other Southern Whig leaders accepted the compromise, regardless of the extreme speeches that some of them had made during the crisis. It is true that the President warmed up to Seward, but this did not mean that he had accepted the ideas of the New York Senator. It was really because he refused to harmonize with the Union-saving Whigs and Democrats. Because he clung stubbornly to his own territorial policy that almost no one was willing to champion and because of the lack of political sagacity on the part of himself and his cabinet, Old Rough and Ready, though a Whig president, became isolated from nearly all of the Whigs in Congress. Had he not unwisely neglected to make advances to Clay, Webster, and other Union-savers among the congressional leaders, the story of the General's days in the White House would read differently. In brief, the Southern anger against President Taylor, in so far as it was manifested by Whigs and Democrats who were Unionists, was closely tied up with his failure to champion the compromise. It was, therefore, part and parcel of the acute estrangement that developed between the administration and the leaders of the administration party in Congress.

Letcher was in Washington in November, 1849, prior to the assembling of Congress. He expected to find things going well, but discovered

<i>States</i>	— <i>Democratic</i> —		— <i>Whig</i> —	
	1844	1848	1844	1848
Mississippi	25,126	26,537	19,206	25,922
Louisiana	13,782	15,370	13,083	18,217
Arkansas	9,546	9,300	5,504	7,538
Texas	8,695	3,770

the cabinet to be in temporary turmoil. "Things are terribly amiss, out of sorts, out of joint, in this quarter," he wrote Crittenden. The situation seemed so bad that he felt that "Clayton ought to quit," because all the other members wanted him out.¹⁹ It turned out that what Letcher found was but a "tempest in a teapot." The cabinet members adjusted matters and continued to stand together—perhaps too closely. Graver things were to come. The cabinet proved unable to work with the Whigs in Congress and, as a result, President Taylor became the forgotten man in so far as political leadership was concerned. To a large extent this situation resulted from the clash of the extremist elements in Congress and the gigantic task that devolved on the Union-savers.

One of the big problems that confronted President Taylor was the distribution of the loaves and fishes. Whig patriots who were hungry for rewards, appeared in large numbers. While Seward was on the way to Washington in March, 1849, he noticed the throng of office seekers who were also moving on the Capital. At the Astor House in New York, he facetiously wrote: "The world seems almost divided into two classes, both of which are moving in the same direction; those who are going to California in search of gold, and those going to Washington in search of offices."²⁰ General Taylor had at first maintained that, if elected, he would be, not a partisan, but a president of all the people. As president-elect he discovered that he must serve Whigs in regard to the offices, and particularly that it was easier to recognize the merits of Taylor Whigs. In January, 1849, Crittenden's friend, A. T. Burnley of Kentucky, who had held conferences with General Taylor, explained Taylor's position to the Kentucky Governor:

General Taylor is opposed to proscription but he says all must go who have interfered in elections, or are incompetent from any cause; and that at anyrate the offices must be equalized, if they are now filled by Democrats. All these rules brought to bear, will not leave many representatives of democracy alive.²¹

It is enough to say that President Taylor and his cabinet did a fairly

¹⁹ Robert P. Letcher to Crittenden, November 17, 1849, Crittenden Papers, XIV.

²⁰ Seward to his wife, New York, February 26, 1849, in Seward, *Seward at Washington*, 100.

²¹ Burnley to Crittenden, New Orleans, January 12, 1849, Crittenden Papers, XIII.

complete job in removing Democrats and rewarding Whigs. There were complaints that the administration was too partial to original Taylor men. There were the usual disappointments in regard to numerous individual appointments on the part of those left out in the cold and their backers. Nevertheless, it was not primarily the distribution of the spoils that weakened the Taylor administration.

The *National Intelligencer*, which had been the Whig organ at Washington since the formation of the party, did not promote Taylor's candidacy prior to the National Convention, and the "masterly inactivity" of this journal during the presidential canvass disgusted Taylor and his friends.²² The result was the establishment of an administration organ, the *Republic*. This newspaper was started by Burnley, though he did not inform the public of his interest in the enterprise. Alexander C. Bullitt of New Orleans and John O. Sargent, an Eastern newspaper man, were installed as editors.²³ Bullitt was very close to Taylor and very fond of him. The new venture was a business success, but the editors and the cabinet soon became hostile to each other. Attempts to harmonize them failed, and the breach widened. Burnley visited Washington in July, 1849, and reported to Crittenden that the cabinet was incompetent. He declared that the members "must go out or General Taylor's administration *must go down*, & with it the hopes of the Whig party, for years, if not forever."²⁴

Bullitt and Sargent continued in charge of the *Republic* and the cabinet remained intact, but the relations between them grew worse. Bullitt, a Southern moderate, was stirred by speeches of Clay, Webster, and others in favor of preserving the Union by compromise. To the President's negative plan, few members of Congress of any element paid any attention. Naturally the *Republic* ran editorials praising the speeches of Clay and Webster. On February 23, 1850, the great compromiser was eulogized:

²² *Id.* to *id.*, Washington, July 22, 1849; Orlando Brown to *id.*, April 19, 1850, *ibid.*, XIV.

²³ Burnley to *id.*, May 15, 1850, *ibid.*; Washington *Republic*, May 14, 1850.

²⁴ Burnley to Crittenden, Washington, July 22, 1849, Crittenden Papers, XIV.

At no time in his long and eventful political career has Mr. Clay occupied a position in which his words were calculated to produce a stronger impression on the public mind. His age, his experience, his illustrious services, his deep hold upon the affections and confidence of the people, his superiority to sectional prejudices and partialities—all unite to lend weight and importance to his suggestions, and to rally to him the wise and prudent and patriotic of all parties in support of the Constitution and the Union.²⁵

On the day following his famous effort, there appeared in the *Republic* a summary of Webster's Seventh of March Speech that was highly laudatory. Several parts of the speech were discussed in a long editorial on March 13. The final paragraph of this editorial declared that, "If the legislation of the country was conducted in the catholic spirit of Mr. Webster's speech, there would be a closer union of States and people than has yet been; closer for conflicts escaped and difficulties overcome." In the preceding paragraph, Bullitt had become eloquent. "The triumph of the statesman was never more complete, or more conspicuous," he proclaimed. "It could be seen every where. . . . It was acknowledged that a blow had been struck for the Union. It was regarded as though the crisis had been passed; that the tempest tossed and billow beaten bark had come safe to harbor."²⁶

The administration's organ must not, however, forget the President whose plan was therefore praised in a *Republic* editorial of March 20. "It is with unmingled satisfaction," the comment ran, "that we observe the growing favor with which the President's plan for disposing of the slavery-extension question is regarded in many parts of the country." The editors had known that such would be true. Nothing would seem necessary to obtain its adoption "save considerate deliberation." In conclusion, however, the editors wished it to be understood that in commending the President's plan, other plans were not being disparaged. This praise was surely faint enough to damn anything. The President saw that the editors of the administration organ had gone over to Clay and Webster and were no longer interested in his policy. He also knew that the editors were through with his cabinet. The General talked the

²⁵ *Washington Republic*, February 23, 1850.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, March 13, 1850.

matter over with Bullitt, who was warmly attached to him personally, but the *Republic* did not change.²⁷

In May, 1850, Burnley appeared in Washington to see what could be done. To ease the situation, Bullitt and Sargent retired and Allen A. Hall became the editor of the *Republic*. Burnley made this arrangement with grave doubts as to its wisdom, but hoped that he had done what was best for General Taylor, the Whig party, his friends, and for himself.²⁸ It is an interesting fact that two months after the death of President Taylor, Hall retired and Sargent took charge of the paper again, with Bullitt actually, though not nominally, his associate.²⁹

It is difficult to understand how the President and his cabinet could become so thoroughly alienated from Congress, but according to the testimony of many men the lack of teamwork was complete. Toombs wrote in April, 1850, that the cabinet had brought the Whig party "to the brink of ruin." In regard to the President, he felt that the General was "an honest and well meaning man" who was in "very bad hands." Without experience in public office and lacking knowledge of men, he was "daily practiced upon" and "peculiarly liable to imposition." Deploing Taylor's alienation from his original friends, Toombs was certain that it would be the President and not his estranged supporters who would suffer most.³⁰

In March, 1850, Humphrey Marshall, member of the House from Kentucky, wrote Crittenden: "I am convinced this Cabinet must dissolve. The Whigs in Congress do not pretend to conceal their dissatisfaction with it." He declared that the departments had not tried to put themselves in touch with Congress.³¹ Charles S. Morehead, also a member of the House from Kentucky, at about the same time, declared the reconstruction of the cabinet to be the only safe course for Taylor. As to the General himself, Morehead said: "I have never been able to converse

²⁷ Brown to Crittenden, Washington, April 19, 1850, Crittenden Papers, XIV.

²⁸ Washington *Republic*, May 14, 1850; Burnley to Crittenden, Washington, May 15, 1850, Crittenden Papers, XIV.

²⁹ Washington *Republic*, September 11, 1850.

³⁰ Toombs to Crittenden, Washington, April 23, 1850, Crittenden Papers, XIV.

³¹ Humphrey Marshall to *id.*, Washington, March 10, 1850, *ibid.*

one minute with the President upon politics without his changing the subject."³²

Said Webster in May, 1850, "I esteem the President, & like him very well. But I cannot . . . proclaim myself a champion for the Administration. . . . The truth is . . . that with a good deal of regard for some members of the Cabinet, the Country has not confidence in it, as a whole, nor has the Whig party. Hence I fear, that the administration is doomed, & the Whig party doomed with it."³³

In the middle of March, 1850, Clay wrote: "I have never before seen such Administration. There is very little coöperation or concord between the two ends of the avenue. There is not a prominent Whig in either House that has any confidential intercourse with the Executive." Seward was mentioned as an exception, but his "Abolition speech" of March 11 had probably cut him off from such intercourse, Clay surmised.³⁴ Seward did remain a friend of President Taylor to the end, but he had a poor opinion of several members of the cabinet and feared that unless they should resign they would "sink down even General Taylor."³⁵

The President's plan was set forth in brief in his first annual message and somewhat more fully in a special message of January 23, 1850. He desired Congress to avoid sectional questions and admit California under the constitution made by the people's representatives in that district. In regard to New Mexico, it would only be necessary to wait until the people of that area should follow the example of California and form a constitution. Then, when admitting New Mexico as a state, the western boundary of Texas could be determined. Crittenden praised this plan.³⁶

³² Charles S. Morehead to *id.*, Washington, March 30, 1850, *ibid.*

³³ Webster to Hall, Washington, May 18, 1850, in Van Tyne (ed.), *Letters of Daniel Webster*, 412-13.

³⁴ Clay to Harlan, Washington, March 16, 1850, in Colton (ed.), *Life, Correspondence and Speeches of Henry Clay*, IV, 604.

³⁵ Seward to his wife, Washington, May 18, 1850, in Seward, *Seward at Washington*, 133.

³⁶ Crittenden to Brown, Frankfort, April 3, 1850, in Mrs. Chapman Coleman, *The Life of John J. Crittenden*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1873), I, 369. By the time this letter was written, however, Crittenden had become converted to compromise. He felt that California should be admitted and territorial governments formed in the remainder of the Mexican Cession without the Wilmot Proviso. In regard to the President he wrote: "In the present state of things I see no inconsistency in the administration's supporting the [compromise]"

Thomas Corwin of Ohio, not satisfied with the compromise plan, seemed favorable to it,³⁷ and Clayton advocated it strongly. Edward Stanley, who represented an interior district of North Carolina, was an ardent Union man, and the staunchest and most consistent supporter of Taylor in either branch of Congress. He was enthusiastically for the Taylor plan in regard to California and New Mexico.³⁸ His was just a voice crying in the wilderness, nevertheless, as his colleagues took no interest in the recommendations of the President.

The death of General Taylor on July 9 came before any of the compromise measures had passed through Congress. It is doubtful whether he would have approved all of them, but this was never brought to a test. In fact, while he lived, it was a question as to what action he would take on Clay's Omnibus Bill should it come to his desk. The Union-savers tried earnestly to carry this measure, and since it could not possibly have been passed over a veto, the presumption is that Clay and other strenuous advocates of its passage expected the President to approve it. There is no indication that a veto was expected. It turned out to be possible to carry through both houses, as five separate bills, what could not be carried as one. There was certainly a much greater danger that Taylor would have vetoed some of the separate bills, had he lived, than that he would have vetoed the Omnibus Bill had it passed.

General Taylor stood by his cabinet to the end and remained persistent. It is not in terms the plan recommended by the President, but it is the same in effect, and modified only by the circumstances that have since occurred. General Taylor's object was to avoid and suppress agitation by inaction. . . . To promote this policy, General Taylor was willing to forego what, under ordinary circumstances, would have been a duty, the establishment of territorial governments without the Wilmot proviso. The prime object was to avoid that proviso and its excitements by inaction. . . . In the attainment of so great an object as that in question, the peace and safety of the Union, it will, as it seems to me, be wise and magnanimous in the administration not to be too tenacious of any particular plan, but to give its active aid and support to any plan that can effect the purpose." These opinions were written to Brown in the hope that they might be passed on to President Taylor and shape his course. Crittenden added that he wanted the plan that "does settle the great question, whatever it may be, or whosoever it may be, to have General Taylor's *Imprimatur* upon it."

³⁷ Thomas Corwin to Crittenden, Washington, June 4, 1850, Crittenden Papers, XIV.

³⁸ This statement is fully borne out by Stanley's speeches in the House during the session of 1849-1850. See, especially, his speech of March 6, 1850, in *Cong. Globe*, 31 Cong., 1 Sess., append., 336-45.

ently loyal to his own solution of the sectional questions that so profoundly disturbed the country. He did not seek the friendship of Clay, Webster, or other Whig leaders. Men had to come to him or remain out of his counsels. He seemed never to have understood why he was not accorded leadership in the solution of the nation's problems after he became president. He realized that his cabinet did not receive recognition and that he was himself largely ignored by the leaders in Congress. He was deeply wounded but allowed only intimate friends to know his feelings. One of these was Orlando Brown, friend of Crittenden, Letcher, and Burnley, who held the post of commissioner of Indian affairs. Because Brown was a close friend of Crittenden, President Taylor sometimes visited him. When together, the two men talked without reserve. Brown's letters to Crittenden furnish a view of the President that can be gotten from no other source. To this friend, in whom he had confidence, General Taylor "spoke as a proud, a brave and a deeply injured man alone can speak of unmerited wrong and unprovoked persecution." This was in April, 1850, and he had been deeply troubled for many months over the fact that he seemed to be playing but a small part as the head of the nation.³⁹ It was a real tragedy that this good man, who was an hon-

³⁹ See Brown to Crittenden, Washington, July 10, 24, 1849; April 19, May 18, 23, 1850, Crittenden Papers, XIV. Letters of Crittenden to Brown indicate that the latter, who was completely trusted by Crittenden, was placed in an appointive office in Washington that he might serve as a link between the Kentucky Governor and the President. Brown was not long in Washington until Crittenden wrote him these significant sentences: "Without anything the least personal or selfish in the wish, I hope you will avail yourself of all opportunities of cultivating the acquaintance, the friendship and the confidence of General Taylor. I desire this for your own sake, for his sake, and for the sake of the country. Such relations with him will be honorable to you, and will, I am certain, be useful to him. His prepossessions are all in your favor, you stand with him as the representative of his great bulwark, Old Kentucky, and he will be glad to have some one with whom he may *talk* outside of the cold, formal limits of the cabinet. That's as *natural* as the desire to break out of prison. You are exactly the man to occupy that relation with him, all circumstances favor it, and nothing but negligence or something worse, will prevent your falling into that position." Crittenden to Brown, Frankfort, July 3, 1849, in Coleman, *Life of John J. Crittenden*, I, 341. There can be no doubt as to the rôle which Brown was expected to play. Crittenden felt that he could not leave Kentucky, he could not persuade Taylor to take Letcher into the cabinet, and, in an attempt to aid Old Rough and Ready, he sought the job of commissioner of Indian affairs for Orlando Brown. Other letters from Crittenden to Brown are of more than ordinary interest. See those of September 5, 1849 (*ibid.*, 347-48), January 14, 1850 (*ibid.*, 352-55), April 30, 1850 (*ibid.*, 367-69), May 18, 1850 (*ibid.*, 371-72), June 7, 1850 (*ibid.*, 372-74).

est, patriotic, and able soldier, by the testimony of all, should have failed so signally to wield a commanding influence in the tangled affairs of the nation while president. To a degree, this was due to the crisis through which the nation was passing during those fateful sixteen months. At any rate it is hard to bestow much blame on the great actors in the drama. Men were stirred deeply by the slavery question, and by the danger to the Union. The times were not kind to the man in the White House. He sensed keenly his failure to achieve and grieved over it deeply, but he remained the master of his own spirit through it all, and kept his "flag flying in front of his tent."

The Rift in Virginia Democracy in 1896

By ALLEN MOGER

During most of the decade of the nineties there were three political groups in Virginia—Democrats, Republicans, and Populists.¹ The organization, position, and purpose of each of these groups were the result of definite economic, social, and political influences of the preceding fifteen years, and the problems and controversies of those years were fought out in a setting conditioned by the heritage of suspicions aroused during civil war and reconstruction. The attempt of the Readjuster-Republicans to regain control had been frustrated on several occasions since their initial defeat in 1883.² Cleveland and the Democratic candidates for Congress were overwhelmingly elected in 1892, and when the Republican leader, William Mahone, died three years later, he left a weak and demoralized party.³

In the process of meeting some of the issues raised by the Readjusters and in order to prevent the growth of Populism as a third party, the Democratic organization, though still conservative, had become more conscious of the interests of the farmers and the people in general.⁴ After 1889 the state Democracy was in a strong though not impregnable position. It had absolute control of the state government and possessed

¹ This paper, in abbreviated form, was read at the third annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association, Durham, North Carolina, November 20, 1937.

² Nelson M. Blake, *William Mahone of Virginia, Soldier and Political Insurgent* (Richmond, 1935), 238-42, 249-50, 261-69.

³ *Ibid.*, 238-42, 249-50, 261-69; R. L. Morton, *Virginia Since 1861* (New York, 1924), 292-301; W. C. Pendleton, *Political History of Appalachian Virginia, 1776-1927* (Dayton, Va., 1927), 288.

⁴ See the appeal of the party chairman, Basil B. Gordon, to the Democratic members of the third party, August 9, 1892, in William Dubose Sheldon, *Populism in the Old Dominion: Virginia Farm Politics, 1885-1900* (Princeton, 1935), 170-71.

the confidence of most of its citizens. Republican history and Democratic tradition placed both liberals and conservatives in the party and gave it the support of the Virginia press. On the other hand, Democratic control of both the state and national governments followed by the repeal in 1894 of all the existing statutes for Federal supervision of elections did much to remove the fear of Negro-Republican rule and weakened the argument for Democratic solidarity.⁵ It was apparent that new and vital issues might cause a breaking or realignment of party affiliations.

The conservative and liberal groups within the Democratic party were by no means harmonious, especially on the currency question. Although public opinion had not been generally aroused on that issue, the retarded and depressed condition of Virginia agriculture seemed to cause most of her leaders to be naturally sympathetic toward the cheap money panaceas which found such large support in other sections harassed by debt and economic frustration. The period of the Readjusters had done much to prepare the soil for Populism in Virginia,⁶ and the two together, plus economic hardship and financial stringency, intensified the radicalism in the Democratic party in the nineties.

Senator John W. Daniel, the most popular man in the state, was throughout his political career an advocate of increasing the volume of the currency as a means of solving or alleviating the economic ills of the masses, and the state's representatives in Congress had overwhelmingly voted for free coinage of silver at every possible opportunity.⁷ Quite naturally then, after the panic of 1893 broke upon the country, Senator Daniel and his Virginia colleagues in Congress entirely disagreed with Cleveland that the sudden distrust and fear "was necessarily chargeable to the silver-purchase legislation."⁸ Daniel, as the "idol of Virginia

⁵ Morton, *Virginia Since 1861*, p. 298.

⁶ C. C. Pearson, *The Readjuster Movement in Virginia* (New Haven, 1917), 177.

⁷ *Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia*, 42 vols. (New York, 1862-1903), 1878, pp. 159, 162-63; 1890, p. 223; 1891, pp. 228-32; 1892, pp. 207-208; Pendleton, *Political History of Appalachian Virginia*, 324.

⁸ Allan Nevins, *Grover Cleveland, A Study in Courage* (New York, 1932), 533. In 1892 a free-coinage proposal provided the biggest fight in the Virginia Democratic convention. To preserve party harmony a compromise plank was adopted and delegates to the

Democracy," vigorously opposed Cleveland's demand for repeal of the Sherman Act,⁹ and he had the masses behind him at the beginning of the contest. But the inarticulate populace could not exert the pressure nor influence the final decision as well as the press and organized business groups which early began to advocate and demand repeal.¹⁰

In this repeal fight the *Lynchburg News*, owned and edited by Carter Glass, was a most vigorous and consistent defender of the "toiling millions of the human race" against the "gold cormorants" and "The Banded Money Sharks"¹¹ of Wall Street. The editor expressed keen displeasure at Cleveland's decision to continue to redeem notes in gold on demand rather than in gold or silver as the law provided.¹² The conference in New York on April 26, 1893,¹³ between treasury representatives and New York bankers was denounced as "an Unholy Alliance," for "Wall Street was never known to make a bargain or extend a helping hand that did not promise a decided advantage."¹⁴ Quoting the *New York Commercial Bulletin*, the *News* said: There "is no possible escape from the conclusion that the New York banks stand *unqualifiedly responsible for having created a run upon the treasury gold* which has produced the present *financial humiliation* of the government and *created general financial confusion*."¹⁵ The inflated and unreasonable

national convention were divided equally between Cleveland and the silver men who favored the nomination of David B. Hill. *New York Times*, May 12, 14, 19, 20, 1892; John Goode, *Recollections of a Lifetime* (New York, 1906), 174.

⁹ See Senator Daniel's speech against repeal, "The Panic—Its Causes and Its Remedies," in Edward M. Daniel (ed.), *Speeches and Orations of John Warwick Daniel* (Lynchburg, Va., 1911), 447-527.

¹⁰ For some time the writer has been working on a broader subject, "Economic and Political Transition in Virginia from 1885 to 1905," but the lack of space necessitates the treatment in this article of the political aspects of the party rift in the 1890's. From an economic point of view Virginia was more in the position of a border state than of a typical Southern state. The advance in business and industry since 1880 had been sufficiently great to give organized business groups unusual power in the last decade of the century, and the state political machine was at times dangerously close to, if not actually identified with, railroad and industrial interests. These facts go far to explain both the agricultural revolt within the party and the sound-money bolt in 1896.

¹¹ Title of first editorial, *Lynchburg News*, April 30, 1893.

¹² *Ibid.*, April 25, 26, 27, 1893.

¹³ James A. Barnes, *John G. Carlisle* (New York, 1931), 240.

¹⁴ *Lynchburg News*, April 28, 1893.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, April 30, 1893. Italics by the *News*.

speculation that had existed in Wall Street in recent months and not the presence of the Sherman law was the real cause of the panic which would ultimately be of benefit to the country in wiping out some of "the speculative rottenness that pervades that gambling den."¹⁶ Most of the state press was jubilant over the decision for repeal, but the *Lynchburg News* felt that the action would have little moral effect on the country because of the delay, and that the "large majority for repeal simply shows the tremendous power of concentrated action and the insidious influence of a dispensation of federal patronage."¹⁷

Virginia supported Cleveland in his fight for the removal of the purchase clause,¹⁸ but the psychological and material benefits of repeal, so confidently predicted by its supporters, failed to be realized.¹⁹ Conditions became worse instead of better, and the average man had expected tangible results toward prosperity. Thousands already possessed almost a religious belief in the efficacy of free silver, and the President's remedy was contrary to their cherished hopes. Was not his real program carried out by a bipartisan majority consisting of Eastern Republicans and Eastern Democrats? asked the silver advocates. And had that combination ever done anything for the South and West?²⁰ Party lines began to break and the real fight for free coinage definitely began after the passage of the repeal resolution. William Jennings Bryan, who worked constantly for the cause, was destined to emerge as the national leader,²¹ and John W. Daniel was always one of his valued henchmen.

By the opening of the presidential campaign in the summer of 1896 business was stagnant, farm prices were still depressed, money was

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, May 9, 1893; see, also, *ibid.*, March 2, May 5, 6, 7, June 15, 1893.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, August 29, 1893; *Norfolk-Virginian*, August 30, September 12, 14, November 11, 1893.

¹⁸ *Congressional Record*, 53 Cong., 1 Sess., 1003-1008, August 28, October 30, 1893.

¹⁹ Barnes, *John G. Carlisle*, 286; A. B. Hepburn, *A History of the Currency in the United States* (New York, 1924), 350-51; A. D. Noyes, *Thirty Years of American Finance* (New York, 1898), 199-200.

²⁰ John D. Hicks, *The Populist Revolt* (Minneapolis, 1931), 312.

²¹ Robert McElroy, *Grover Cleveland*, 2 vols. (New York, 1923), II, 36. For an account of the national campaign for silver carried on by Bryan and his followers, see James A. Barnes, "The Gold Standard Democrats and the Party Conflict," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1915-), XVII (1931), 422-50; *id.*, *John G. Carlisle*, Chap. XVII.

scarcer than ever, and the years of depression and hardship had caused the people to become bitter and to look more and more to the government for relief. Was it not true, they argued, that Cleveland and his "gold contractionists" had promised improvement and none had come by adhering to their program? Were not all bankers, money lenders, capitalists, monopolists, millionaires, and most of the Republicans on the side of gold? asked the *Lynchburg News*.²² And at least the silver men had always claimed that their program was especially designed to aid the common people. By the time the state Democratic convention was held at Staunton in June, 1896, the silver wing of the party was well organized under the leadership of Peter J. Otey.²³ Each of the two money factions within the party held its caucus, but it was evident from the beginning that the silver men would be triumphant. And so victorious were they that "A Silver Carnival" was the headline given the news story of the convention by the *Richmond Times*.²⁴

The gold men at the convention were not organized. In the unavoidable absence of Joseph Bryan, editor of the *Richmond Times* and the recognized leader of the sound-money men, Beverly B. Munford of Richmond led the fight for gold. In the sound-money caucus, he said that their "purpose was to show the world that the people of Virginia had not all gone crazy."²⁵ In presenting his gold plank to the convention Munford gave a thorough argument against the idea of free coinage, insisting that "our people ask for a sure relief and a restoration of confidence, and you answer them with a scheme, the effect of which is the merest matter of speculation and conjecture and against the wisdom of which the experience of the ages utterly protests."²⁶ His gold substitute was defeated 1,276 to 371.

Probably leaders from no state exercised greater influence in the national convention than those from Virginia. At a caucus of silver lead-

²² *Lynchburg News*, July 9, 1896; Barnes, *John G. Carlisle*, 477.

²³ *Lexington Rockbridge County News*, May 21, June 11, 1896; *Richmond Times*, June 4, 1896.

²⁴ *Richmond Times*, June 5, 1896.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, June 4, 1896.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, June 5, 1896.

ers on the eve of the convention's opening the executive committee of five, of which Senator Daniel was a member, was made a permanent steering committee, which, together with the general silver committee consisting of one member from each state, was to guide the fate of silver through the convention. At the time Senator J. K. Jones of the executive committee boasted that three men, Senator Daniel, Governor John P. Altgeld, and he could even then tell exactly what the convention would do.²⁷ Three days later the silver men amid wild enthusiasm rejected the national committee's recommendation of David B. Hill for temporary chairman and placed Senator Daniel in the chair by the vote of 556 to 349. Daniel's handsome and impressive appearance, his clarion voice, his positive courtesy and dignity, and his complete devotion to the silver cause made him the man of the hour. His keynote speech was a summary indictment of the Republican party and a rapturous glorification of the virtues of silver. It was apparent that the keynote of the Chicago convention would be silver, and the currency question was the only one discussed in the keynote address.²⁸

Unusual influence was exerted by Carter Glass, a member of the resolutions committee which framed the platform. He urged Senator Hill not to ask for an endorsement of the Cleveland administration, for neither the committee nor the convention favored it; and when Hill persisted, it was on motion of Glass that the resolution endorsing the administration was tabled by the platform committee.²⁹ The plank against national banks or banks of issue was opposed by Glass and the other Virginia delegates, Glass arguing in the committee that Virginia was a conservative state and that such might be damaging to the people there. To this Senator Benjamin R. Tillman replied, "I can go down to

²⁷ *New York Times*, July 4, 1896.

²⁸ Full address in Daniel (ed.), *Speeches and Orations of John Warwick Daniel*, 649-58.

²⁹ In the columns of the *Lynchburg News*, Cleveland had been condemned as a "party wrecker" whose administration was "in sympathy with capitalistic combines and out of sympathy with the party's warfare against the organized enemies of the producing classes." "God be praised," it continued, that silver has "made democracy once more a party militant rather than a personal appendage," a party which will be able to unite "for the doctrines which brought it into existence, and have until latterly guided its destiny." *Lynchburg News*, June 12, 1896.

your state and raise sheol on this issue."³⁰ Also Glass proposed in the committee an amendment to the free-silver platform in the form of an instruction to the President to convene Congress in a special session immediately after March, 1897, to enact a free-coinage act and whatever legislation might be necessary to carry it into effect.³¹

The free-silver press in Virginia was jubilant over the action at Chicago. Glass immediately telegraphed a signed editorial four paragraphs in length which was published the next day on the front page of his *Lynchburg News*.³² In it he commended the nomination of Bryan as "a spontaneous declaration of the organized democracy at Chicago for a man who would best personify the great principle of financial emancipation for which the plain people have been desperately fighting."

No Eastern paper was more caustic or bitter than the *Richmond Times*, which characterized the convention as the "most emotional, hysterical, irrational body of its size that ever assembled." The platform was prepared by Populists and was composed of anarchy and socialism.³³ The convention ignored the eminent men of the party as candidates and "in a spasm of hysteria, ran off and nominated a mere youth, who was scarcely known of, because he rattled off before it a studied piece of sophomorical rhodomontade that did not contain a single sound proposition, and abounded in nonsense and anarchy in equal proportions from beginning to end." It turned its back upon the old-time and cherished principles of Democracy and adopted the issues and dangerous heresies "that have emanated from the disordered brains of all the cranks that the troubled period since the war has produced." Bryan's speech was considered worst where he deliberately attempted to array class against class:

To talk about the toiling masses on the one hand, and idle capital in the idle hands on the other, with a view of exhibiting the one against the other, is vicious and revolutionary and tends to the breach of the peace and the overthrow of society. . . . Why should those who by labor and diligence, or by inheritance,

³⁰ A special to the *Richmond Dispatch*, cited by the *Lynchburg News*, July 10, 1896.

³¹ Cited from the *New York World*, July 8, 1896, by the *Lynchburg News*, July 10, 1896. Colonel J. E. West, one of the gold delegates, said to the writer on July 2, 1934, "Glass talked me to death to convert me to free silver at Chicago."

³² *Lynchburg News*, July 11, 1896.

³³ *Richmond Times*, July 17, 1896.

have become possessed of a competence, or more than a competence of affluence, be deprived of any part of it for the benefit of others, who desire and are laboring for the same thing.⁸⁴

Almost immediately a small group of gold Democrats in Virginia began to lay plans for independent action. The leadership was provided by the Richmond *Times*, published by Joseph Bryan, with William L. Royall as chief editorial writer.⁸⁵ The call went out for a state convention, which was held in Richmond late in August. Called to order by the *Times'* publisher, the convention soon organized, making Captain James A. Bumgardner of Staunton permanent chairman and Henry W. Anderson secretary. They claimed to be the "real Democracy," and nearly all spoke not only of the fear of free silver but of what lay "behind the Chicago platform," which many called communism and socialism. "Think of Watson, Marion Butler, Coxey, Debs, Tillman, Altgeld, and all that crew working together for the advancement of their wild theories," exclaimed one. And Captain Bumgardner brought down the house with his exclamatory remarks:

They call us "bolters." Who? The advocates of the Chicago platform which in thirteen of its seventeen planks is a stupendous bolt from the theory and practice and the conditions and history of the Democratic party. Call us bolters! Who? They who have spiked the Democratic guns; who have abandoned the Democratic standards; who have fraternized with the deadly foes of Democratic principles; and have surrendered the very ark of our Democratic covenant into the hands of the heathen!

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, July 14, 1896.

⁸⁵ W. L. Royall, *Some Reminiscences* (New York, 1909), 202-203. Royall had been chief attorney for the bondholders in the famous Funder-Readjuster fight, and his editorials in the Richmond *Times* indicate not only his desire for sound money but also his opposition to government regulation of corporations and other liberal legislation. In March, 1893, the following editorial appeared in the Richmond *Times*, and it is worthy of quotation as an illustration of the laissez faire attitude of the business interests of the period: "We took sharp issue in Sunday's Times with Mr. Cleveland's remarks in his inaugural address on the subject of combination of business men for business purposes. . . . We are surprised at the position Mr. Cleveland takes because it is a distinct intimation that he would favor legislation directed toward forcing a dissolution of business combinations that men interested in the businesses have formed. Disguise it as you may, *this would be communism pure and simple*. If the principle that property once lawfully acquired may be attacked by legislation is tolerated in the case of what we call trusts, then the sacredness of property is ended." Richmond *Times*, quoted in the Lynchburg *News*, March 9, 1893. Italics by the writer.

We shall answer by remaining true to Democratic principles and by keeping guard on the "watchtowers of our faith," he concluded. S. V. Southall of Charlottesville, who claimed that he lived near, and drank of, the fount of Jeffersonian Democracy, proclaimed that "those are best governed who are least governed," as he denounced the paternalism which assumed that government had a right to tell a citizen that he could not make a gold contract. "I am no Chicago platform Democrat; no Coxey Democrat; no Mrs. Lease Democrat," cried Royall, and Joseph Bryan's forceful observation that the real issue was one of "National probity and honor" was followed by "My Country 'tis of Thee," played by the band.⁸⁶

The plank of most immediate importance in the platform,⁸⁷ which was presented by Bryan and enthusiastically adopted by the convention, concerned the currency. A positive position was taken in favor of the gold standard, "which was put into practical use by Jackson and has remained the standard of value . . . ever since," and "has been the substantial basis of every contract made in this country for over sixty years. To abolish that standard of value now and substitute an inferior, debased, and fluctuating standard would be unwise as to all future contracts, but as to those already made would be the most stupendous financial crime ever consummated" and would cause convulsion of business and losses to those least able to bear them.

The inadequacy of the currency system was generally recognized by

The *Richmond Times*, May 21, 1895, strongly commended the action of the Supreme Court in declaring the income tax law unconstitutional: "Yesterday was a red-letter day in the defense of our institutions. Guided and prompted by the spirit of yesterday's decision, there is no limit to be put upon our future prosperity and glory. Had the Supreme Court sanctioned the unlawful and unjust raid upon man's rights contemplated by the income-tax law, our upward career would have received a check of which no man would have been able to foresee the end."

⁸⁶ *Richmond Times*, August 28, 1896; *New York Times*, August 28, 1896.

⁸⁷ The complete platform is available in the *Richmond Times*, August 28, 1896. Virginia furnished a leader at the Indianapolis meeting of the sound-money men on August 7, where plans were made to hold a convention of "National Democrats" early in September. It should be noted that the platform herein discussed was framed by Virginia leaders a week before the national meeting was held and its platform prepared. *Ibid.*, August 13, September 3, 4, 1896. The Virginia document was a local product, and it undoubtedly influenced the national meeting at which the Old Dominion had a good representation. The "National Democrats" of 1896 were much like the "Jeffersonian Democrats" of 1936.

the speakers, and a controversy ensued over the advisability of demanding the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on state bank notes. Finally it was decided to urge such legislation "as will remove the oppressive features of the national bank law, and permit an enlargement to banks of the right to issue notes redeemable on demand in lawful money, gold, silver, or other legal tender under such limitations as may be deemed wise and safe." Perhaps no plan could have been more vague on the banking problem.

The convention went wild when the section was read "which denounced the unworthy attempt at Chicago to sully the administration of Grover Cleveland," who in history would tower "above the Populism of Chicago and the paternalism of St. Louis."

The last paragraph was a fervent appeal to "brother Democrats throughout the State to study anew the foundations of Democracy . . . , to return to the ways of our fathers, and to unite with us in restoring the Democratic party to its place as the true exponent of the safest and surest political wisdom and the champion of equal rights to all men."

The platform is interesting as an illustration of the traditional attitude taken by the conservative wing of the Democratic party in the South made up of the larger farmers and the increasingly important business men and bankers. They renewed their allegiance to the much misinterpreted "party principles of Jefferson and Jackson," asserted the equality of every citizen before the law, denounced the growing tendency to look to the government for aid, "a tendency encouraged by the Republicans . . . and carried to its natural and logical conclusion by the Populists." They opposed the government's assumption of any business which might be done by its citizens for such would mean the creation of a "centralized socialism, in which the citizen would be lost in the government, individuality be extinguished, and personal liberty abridged." The attack of the regular Democrats upon Cleveland's action in the Pullman strike was denounced, while the phrases in the Chicago platform opposing the income tax decision were interpreted as an attempt to sap and undermine a decision of the United States Supreme Court by methods which would bring the court into contempt and shock the nation's re-

spect for law and order. The "proposition in the Chicago platform to forbid citizens to make contracts in any kind of money they may select" was represented as an "arbitrary act of tyranny." The platform was eminently conservative and of the type that men possessing property and holding to laissez faire principles would normally support. It took little cognizance of changing conditions or of changing needs. Advocating no great reforms and displaying little political vision, it insisted that only the traditional principles of the Democratic party—opposition to sumptuary legislation, economy in government, tariff for revenue only, and rigorous defense of the Constitution and the Supreme Court—could save the country.

The sound-money men began in earnest to perfect an organization which would command the attention and win the support of the people. In September the state committee made General T. M. Logan, formerly a railroad official and a member of the Democratic executive committee, chairman of the "National Democratic" party in Virginia, and it was under his leadership that the campaign was organized and carried out.³⁸

During August and September sound-money clubs were formed throughout the state. These clubs were strongest in the cities, especially in Richmond and in the intellectual centers where institutions of higher learning were located. The leaders came from the business and professional groups and those who held property, and they naturally sought to enlist the laboring classes who were dependent upon them. Charges, repeatedly made, that the workers in the Chesapeake and Ohio shops were being coerced or enticed into organizing sound-money clubs³⁹ and into voting the way the company's officers wanted them to vote,⁴⁰ were denied,⁴¹ but the Richmond *Times* took the position that the employer was doing a real service to his employees if, by public statements, newspaper interviews, and other ways, he caused them to fear the cheap dollar.⁴² An observer reported that the group which heard former Gov-

³⁸ Richmond *Times*, September 11, 1896.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, August 19, 20, September 23, 1896.

⁴⁰ Lynchburg *News*, August 28, 1896; Richmond *Dispatch*, *passim*.

⁴¹ Richmond *Times*, September 6, 9, 1896.

⁴² *Ibid.*, August 22, 1896.

ernor Cameron in Lexington really owned the county, but that the "riff-raff" were also present, they being glad to follow.⁴³ The sound-money "vote is composed chiefly of business men and corporation employees," men who consider practical results as more important than mere partisan loyalty, wrote the Virginia correspondent for the *New York Times*.⁴⁴ Mark Hanna hesitated at first to spend money in Virginia, fearing his efforts would be overcome by fraud, but after a conference in New York with some of the sound-money leaders from the state, he agreed to make a real fight and to give financial assistance to the Palmer and Buckner organization there. It was estimated that the Republicans spent as much as \$160,000 on the campaign in the state.⁴⁵ Certainly the "coalitionists" had an abundance of money.⁴⁶ The National Democratic organization was outwardly a third party, but very close co-operation was gradually effected with the state and national Republican leaders. The real fight was between McKinley and Bryan. M. E. Ingalls of Cincinnati, president of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad and one of the chief sound-money Democratic campaigners in the state, was considered by the *Richmond Dispatch* as the backbone of the opposition to the Democratic party in Virginia and the connecting link between the Republican national committee and the Democratic bolters' organization.⁴⁷

The sound-money group contained many men who had formerly been among the most prominent and highly respected leaders in the Democratic party, such as Basil B. Gordon, formerly the chairman of the Democratic state committee, the Democratic governor, Charles T. O'Ferrall, Judge John T. Goolrick of Fredericksburg, and others equally prominent.⁴⁸

The issues fought out in the press and on the stump were several, but

⁴³ M. W. Paxton, former editor of the *Rockbridge County News*, to the writer, May 2, 1933.

⁴⁴ *New York Times*, October 30, 1896.

⁴⁵ Royall, *Some Reminiscences*, 202-203; *Norfolk-Virginian*, August 1, 1896.

⁴⁶ *New York Times*, October 25, 1896.

⁴⁷ *Richmond Dispatch*, cited in the *Lynchburg News*, September 15, 1896; *New York Times*, October 28, 1896.

⁴⁸ *New York Times*, October 25, 1896; *Richmond Times*, July 22, August 13, September 22, 1896; *Lexington Rockbridge County News*, October 15, 1896.

the currency question was by far the most important. In July Senator Daniel predicted that all of the Chicago platform except the silver plank would soon be forgotten.⁴⁹ Realizing that the money issue was their chief claim for support, all the Republican and sound-money speakers sought especially to impress the people with the fallacies of free silver.⁵⁰ The issue of Democratic solidarity and home rule on the one hand and the fear of Negro-Republican rule on the other was stressed by the silver men. The insistence of former highly respected Democrats upon the registration of Negroes and the recording of their votes,⁵¹ caused the *Richmond Dispatch* to charge them with attempting to "negrofy" Virginia by laying the foundation to turn the state over to them in 1897. "In such a time of peril shall not blood prove thicker than water?" asked the *Dispatch*. "The only peril menacing the people of Virginia now, and they know it, is the attack upon thrift and honesty, law and order, made in the platform which the *Dispatch* advocates," responded the *Rockbridge County News*.⁵² All this, insisted the sound-money press and orators, was an attempt on the part of the silverites to cloud the issue by appealing to sectional, party, class, and race prejudice.⁵³

During September and October there was a feeling that the Bryan cause in the country was weakening,⁵⁴ but the sound-money men in Virginia only redoubled their energies; and towards the end of the campaign the state was deluged with both literature and oratory for the gold cause.⁵⁵ On the other hand Bryan and Sewall clubs were formed in all parts of Virginia, and efforts were made to put every available speaker of note on the stump.⁵⁶ Bryan himself spoke in Richmond in September before what was declared to be the largest political gathering

⁴⁹ *Lynchburg News*, July 17, 1896.

⁵⁰ *Lexington Rockbridge County News*, October 15, 1896; *Richmond Times*, October 10, 12, 15, 1896; *Norfolk-Virginian*, September 15, 1896.

⁵¹ *New York Times*, October 25, 1896.

⁵² *Lexington Rockbridge County News*, October 22, 1896.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, October 29, 1896; *Richmond Times*, November 3, 1896.

⁵⁴ James F. Rhodes, *History of the United States from Hayes to McKinley* (New York, 1919), 28; Barnes, *John G. Carlisle*, 480-85.

⁵⁵ *Lexington Rockbridge County News*, September 17, October 29, 1896; *New York Times*, October 28, 30, 1896; *Norfolk-Virginian*, November 1, 1896.

⁵⁶ *Lexington Rockbridge County News*, October 15, 1896.

ever held in Virginia.⁵⁷ At Lexington on the day before the election, Daniel was met by the Stonewall Brigade Band of Staunton and was brought from the station on a "drag" drawn by sixteen white horses, indicating silver, followed by a small yellow donkey, bringing up the rear, "as it should," and bearing the inscription, "Sample gold bug." The gold and silver adherents indicated their allegiance by wearing yellow and white chrysanthemums respectively.⁵⁸

Silver and gold really became symbols of justice and injustice, democracy and plutocracy; the average man at the crossroads store and on the city street confidently discussed the merits of the two metals, the discussion sometimes ending in a fight.⁵⁹ Although they were unceasingly discussed, the issues were hardly understood. But the people of Virginia were thoroughly aroused. Father and son appeared as leaders on opposite sides,⁶⁰ business alliances were threatened or dissolved,⁶¹ and even violence occurred in some cases. Threats were made to throw the reporters of the *Richmond Times* out of the silver meetings, and a mob was thwarted in its attempted assault upon the *Times* office only by the hasty summoning of police.⁶² At Amherst a mob of silverites attempted to prevent Bumgardner from speaking, yelling that no gold bug could speak there.⁶³ At Gloucester on county court day both Democratic and Republican speakers appeared. Joseph Christian, formerly a judge of the Virginia Supreme Court, was "drowned by a bedlam of yells and screams, recalling the wild commune of the French Revolution," and the Judge was unable to make his speech.⁶⁴ Unofficial threats that Randolph-Macon trustees intended to discipline Professor R. E. Blackwell for his

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, September 24, 1896.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, November 5, 1896.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, October 29, 1896.

⁶⁰ At the same time Captain James Bumgardner was introducing William E. Cameron at Staunton, the former's son was speaking for the regular Democracy a few blocks away.

⁶¹ Because of his party regularity, Carter Glass, editor of the *Lynchburg News*, alienated some of his best friends who did bolt the ticket. The man who lent Glass the money with which to buy his newspaper bolted and became furious with him; Glass responded that he could have the paper but that he himself would not change his political mind. Senator Glass to the writer, November 19, 1934.

⁶² Henry D. Perkins, *Richmond Times* reporter in 1896, to the writer, June 19, 1934.

⁶³ *Lexington Rockbridge County News*, September 24, 1896.

⁶⁴ *Richmond Times*, October 8, 1896.

activities for sound money caused him to be careful not to miss any of his classes.⁶⁵ Men grew angry at Cleveland's name. In retrospect Henry St. George Tucker remembered that he was cut by old friends; former supporters shook their fists in his face; and he even feared physical violence as he went about the tenth district.⁶⁶ Governor O'Ferrall was expelled from the Virginia Democratic Association in Washington by a "unanimous and vociferous vote" because he bolted Bryan and openly campaigned for McKinley, and he was loudly hissed by audiences in Richmond.⁶⁷ It was indeed a "campaign of many incidents that are not less distressing than exasperating," though the *Lynchburg News*⁶⁸ used that statement to indicate its disgust at Governor O'Ferrall and the Richmond *Times*.

In the columns of these two papers are found probably the most definite statements and the most bitter expressions of the attitudes of the two forces in the "Battle of the Standards" in Virginia. On election day each paper editorially summarized what it considered the real issues. Accusing the Richmond *Dispatch* of arousing passions, prejudices, and sentiments, the *Times* said: "The issue today is not the Force bill, nor negro rule, nor coercion, nor the principles for which the South went to war—The true issues are sound money, sound government, and an honest ballot."⁶⁹ The following was the first editorial in the *News*:⁷⁰

THE BATTLE ON

Today the plain people of this country will line up in battle against the hosts of mammon⁷¹ and upon the issue of the fight depends the nation's welfare and the hope of every man who must rely upon his daily toil for subsistence.

On the one side are arrayed the great body of the common people, who work industriously, observe the laws and love their country for the protection it affords

⁶⁵ Dr. R. E. Blackwell to the writer, April 14, 1933.

⁶⁶ Henry St. George Tucker to Allan Nevins, cited in his *Grover Cleveland*, 693.

⁶⁷ *Lexington Gazette*, September 30, 1896.

⁶⁸ *Lynchburg News*, October 4, 1896.

⁶⁹ *Richmond Times*, November 3, 1896.

⁷⁰ *Lynchburg News*, November 3, 1896.

⁷¹ Bryan wrote in an editorial for the *Omaha World-Herald*, February 26, 1896: "The Democratic party cannot serve God and Mammon; it cannot support plutocracy and at the same time defend the rights of the masses." William J. Bryan, *The First Battle: A Story of the Campaign of 1896* (Chicago, 1896), 126.

them and their fellow men. Opposed to these are the great money-combinations, the grinding trusts, the tariff-robbers, and the election purchasers, who get their riches through cruel systems, perverted laws, unequal taxation, and merciless oppression of their countrymen. In the ranks of these are unhappily, many good men, the victims of misinformation or the dupes of specious appeals to cupidity. In their ranks are also men whose influence has been bought and whose action is constrained and whose votes for the Republican candidate will be wrung from them as the price of their employment.

If the election is fair; if the country is not for sale; if a large part of the American people are not debauched, the next President of the United States will be William Jennings Bryan.

On the other hand, if the Presidency is purchased; if liberty of conscience is outraged; if bribery and fraud are triumphant, the next President of the United States will be Marcus Aurelius [*sic*] Hanna, assignee of William McKinley and the incarnate spirit of all that is gross, all that is detestable in American politics of the present day.

The battle is on! And we await the determination of it with a fervent hope that the right will prevail and that the God of infinite wisdom will preserve the nation and bless the people.

The day of the election passed without any outward violence, but much tenseness prevailed in some sections, and two days later the chairman of the state Republican party issued a statement charging enormous frauds on the part of the Democrats.⁷² The Walton election law,⁷³ passed in 1894, had given the party in power complete control of the election machinery, and under the circumstances there was justification for apprehension on the part of the opponents of the regular Democrats in a campaign in which so much was considered at stake by both groups.

The total vote in Virginia was 294,664.⁷⁴ Bryan carried the state by a

⁷² *New York Times*, November 6, 1896.

⁷³ *Acts of Assembly, Virginia*, 1893-1894, pp. 862-67; Pendleton, *Political History of Appalachian Virginia*, 374-76. By this law the ballot was made official and secret, and elections were placed under the control of a local election board which was almost invariably Democratic. The law made possible an improvement over the haphazard elections of other days when a few politicians determined and marked the votes of thousands of illiterate Negroes and whites. It accomplished its double purpose of disfranchising many of the Negroes and of placing the Democratic party securely in power. It encouraged a continuation of corruption, and was agreeable to no group in Virginia other than the regular Democracy.

⁷⁴ Unless otherwise stated, all the election figures given below are compiled from the returns given in the *World Almanac*, 1894, pp. 419-20; 1898, pp. 454-55; 1932, p. 912; *Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1896, p. 783.

plurality of 19,341 in contrast with the plurality of 50,715 given Cleveland in 1892.⁷⁵ The sound-money Democrats who bolted the party voted overwhelmingly for McKinley, for Palmer and Buckner received only 2,129 votes, while even the Prohibition candidate, with almost no organization, exceeded that number by 221. The party solidarity plea was severely weakened by changed conditions and more important economic issues. The Democratic-Populist vote in 1896 was 21,543 less than the added Democratic and Populist vote in 1892, while the Republicans received 22,106 more than in the previous election. The largest gains received by the Republicans were in the Valley and in Southwest Virginia. Twenty of the thirty-two counties west of the Blue Ridge and in the southwestern part of the state went Republican, the popular vote being 49,689 for McKinley and 46,136 for Bryan. The great shift in the vote of this section is better indicated by the fact that only 4 of the 32 counties were carried by Harrison in 1892 when the Republicans received 38.6 per cent of the popular vote in contrast to the 51.8 per cent received in 1896.

History, tradition, and economic interests supply the explanation for this strong Republican and sound-money vote in the western part of Virginia. Friction, for various reasons, between the eastern and western counties of the state had been so prolonged and continuous that it might be said to have become traditional. It had caused the disruption of the state. Although faithful to the Old Dominion during the recent war, party loyalties had since become less important in the Valley and in Southwest Virginia where the strong old Whig minority resented the

⁷⁵ Exact figures concerning the total number of eligible voters are not available. Under the franchise law all males above twenty-one years of age were eligible to vote if they registered and met the residence requirements. The poll tax had been eliminated in 1882 as a requirement for voting. After that there were no changes in the voting qualifications until after the turn of the century. J. A. C. Chandler, "The History of Suffrage in Virginia," in Johns Hopkins University *Studies in Historical and Political Science*, XIX (Baltimore, 1901), Nos. 6-7, p. 70.

Males, white and colored, of voting age in the state:

1890.....	378,782	1900.....	447,501
-----------	---------	-----------	---------

Votes cast:

1892.....	282,252	1896.....	294,664	1900.....	264,240
-----------	---------	-----------	---------	-----------	---------

post-bellum union with their former political enemies, the Democrats.⁷⁶ Twenty-two of the thirty-two counties had supported Mahone in his Readjuster fight of 1879,⁷⁷ and from then until the end of the century the political alignment of most of the counties was not consistent. Revulsion against Mahone's methods and dissatisfaction with the Republican national administration gave the section to Cleveland in 1892. Extensive railroad construction and incipient industrial development in the southwestern part of Virginia⁷⁸ since about 1880 caused the section to look with favor upon McKinley's high tariff policies.⁷⁹ Railroad and mining interests wanted money and more favorable conditions for the development of mineral resources and manufacturing, and they were convinced that free silver would be injurious to their cause. In 1896 prominent Democratic business men as well as political leaders, such as Governor O'Ferrall, did not hesitate to unite with the Republican leaders, such as William C. Pendleton, in order to save the country for "sound money and an honest ballot." And those conservative leaders greatly influenced the vote of the economic classes dependent upon them.

There is evidence to support the charge of the gold Democrats and the Republicans that fraud and corruption took place, but it is doubtful if that corruption was greater than in previous elections. Dishonest elections had been almost customary in Virginia since the famous Readjuster fights when the Democrats adopted fraudulent practices to beat Mahone at his own game. Many people would vote only if paid and directed, and no doubt such practices were continued in 1896.⁸⁰ It had become normal for the Negro to vote the Republican ticket either of his own

⁷⁶ Pearson, *Readjuster Movement in Virginia*, 103-108.

⁷⁷ Blake, *William Mahone of Virginia*, map, 185.

⁷⁸ *A Handbook of Virginia* (1893), 100-104; *Reference Book of the Norfolk and Western Railroad Company* (undated, but apparently 1889); *Lynchburg Daily Virginian*, January 1, 1890; January 1, 1891; V. S. Clark, *History of Manufactures in the United States, 1860-1914* (Washington, 1928), 163-64, 189, 211-12, 560.

⁷⁹ *Lynchburg Daily Advance*, January 1, 1890. In 1886 both houses of the Virginia legislature passed resolutions in favor of a tariff to protect the iron interests of the state. The *Richmond Dispatch* was of the opinion that the members spoke for their constituents and for a large majority of the people of Virginia. The *Lynchburg News*, *Lynchburg Virginian*, *Staunton Vindicator*, and *Richmond Whig* also favored such protection. *Richmond Dispatch*, April 17, July 11, 1886.

⁸⁰ Blackwell to the writer, April 14, 1933.

accord or as a result of purchase and direction by the party leaders, and for that reason the Democrats in many of the black counties adopted methods either to eliminate or to control the Negro vote. During the debate in the constitutional convention of 1901-1902, fraud in the black belt was generally acknowledged.⁸¹

The fundamental issues in few national campaigns have been more grossly misrepresented than those of 1896. It is a weakness of democracy that all too many political leaders strive to protect the interests of the most powerful group among those who give them support rather than the interests of the country as a whole. The partisans of the time were blinded by the interests of the group they represented and those interests were so blended with traditional and emotional appeals that the historical student must investigate much more than the current arguments if he is to give a just appraisal of the issues involved. For years most historians have failed to give justice to Bryan and the real cause he represented, a fact for which the radicalism and shallowness of many of the great Commoner's speeches are partly responsible.

The contest was really one of the great battles of history between conservative and liberal ideals, between those who believe in economic individualism and traditional ideas of finance and those who feel that new economic advances require that the government be more directly active in the interests of most of the people. The weakness of one group seemed to be the lack of imagination and unswerving devotion to extreme financial orthodoxy, and that of the other extreme financial radicalism inspired and provoked by a sense of injustice and a belief in

⁸¹ R. L. Morton, "The Negro in Virginia Politics, 1865-1902," *University of Virginia Publications, Phelps-Stokes Fellowship Papers*, No. 4 (Charlottesville, 1919), 146; Chandler, "The History of Suffrage in Virginia," in *loc. cit.*, 73. Fraud was practiced by both groups, especially in the thirty-five counties having black majorities. In most of the counties the Democrats controlled the election machinery and were better able to control the voting. Of these thirty-five counties, twenty-one were carried by Bryan and the total Democratic vote was considerably increased while that of the Republicans was smaller than in 1892. All but two of the fourteen Negro counties that went for McKinley had been Republican and only nine of the twenty-one Negro counties that went for Bryan had been Democratic in the last presidential election. On the other hand, the situation was reversed in the sixty-five counties having white majorities. In these the Republicans received an increase of 19,272 and the Democrats a decrease of 4,228 as compared to the vote of 1892.

emotional idealism. Cleveland was honest and sincere, if sometimes somewhat unnecessarily stubborn in his stand for sound money, but expressions of sympathy were not enough for the thousands who were suffering, losing their homes through no fault of their own, and whose obligations were rapidly accelerating for reasons that they knew not. His attitude, often misunderstood, increased the despair of the masses, and that despair gave the desired opportunity to the silverites whose moral enthusiasm and tendency toward exaggeration served to confuse or to cover up the real causes which made possible the silver crusade.

In the heat of close political contests it is difficult for politicians to analyze and correctly appraise, and in 1896 few leaders made serious attempts to do either. In Virginia both sides repeatedly made extreme and unfounded accusations and recriminations. The free-silver advocates greatly emphasized the idea that the "gold standard was, after all, largely a curtain behind which were concealed all the gigantic vested interests, built up with such appalling rapidity under benign Republican rule since the War between the States."⁸² On the other hand, the *Richmond Times* declared that the forces behind the Bryan platform and ticket aimed at the overthrow of order, the plundering of the thrifty, and the revolutionizing of society.⁸³ Before the campaign had become so intense the same paper had taken a more realistic point of view when it agreed with the *New York Journal of Commerce* that it was entirely incorrect to ascribe dishonest motives to the individuals and communities that were carried away with the cry for free silver. It was recognized that the whole agitation turned upon a "desire for more ample credit facilities and a more elastic currency," and that the demand for free coinage was an expression of a real and "legitimate want or the grasping at a remedy, however mistaken, for some real financial ailment." Hence it was not enough to show that free silver would make matters worse, but it should be determined whether credit facilities of the South and West were sufficient for their needs, and how, if at all, those facilities could be expanded by legislation. "To preach the advantages of

⁸² Paxton Hibben, *The Peerless Leader, William Jennings Bryan* (New York, 1929), 190.

⁸³ *Richmond Times*, August 15, 1896.

saving to a farmer who has to part with the whole margin of profit on his crop for the use of the money he needs to raise it, is like expatiating on the delights of freedom to the inmates of a prison. The one potent fact of his position is that it is one of industrial bondage," concluded the New York paper.⁸⁴ It is not surprising that the strongest demand for currency inflation came from those sections of the South and West that were handicapped by the inadequacy of their banking facilities.⁸⁵

The great battle served to educate both politicians and voters, and as such it was one of those growing pains necessarily connected with progressive democracy. As political passions gradually cooled leaders began to realize that there were both truth and falsity in the contentions of both groups. Carter Glass, one of the most ardent supporters of Bryan, began a careful study of the banking and currency question after he entered Congress in 1903. That study led him to believe that the breakdown of the currency and credit facilities produced the panic of 1893 and that Bryan appeared as a man able to take advantage of that breakdown.⁸⁶ He reached the conclusion that Bryan's financial remedy was too extreme, but he became even more convinced that the currency and banking structure of the country needed drastic transformation.⁸⁷ The greatest fight of his life was in trying to secure the improvements which would be beneficial to the average man as well as the financier, and he was to find that the most bitter opponents of his efforts were the privileged groups similar to those to whom in 1896 he had referred as the "Banded Money Sharks" and "gold cormorants" of Wall Street.

Viewed dispassionately, the election in Virginia is important for the light it throws on political, economic, and social conditions in a border

⁸⁴ Editorial in the New York *Journal of Commerce*, quoted in the Richmond *Times*, June 11, 1896.

⁸⁵ Hepburn, *History of the Currency in the United States*, 339-40, 435, 537.

⁸⁶ Senator Glass to the writer, November 19, 1934. For an able and clear discussion of the conditions and forces which gave rise to the unrest and to Bryan, see Mark Sullivan, *Our Times: The United States, 1900-1925*, 6 vols. (New York, 1926-1935), I, Chaps. VI-IX.

⁸⁷ See speeches by Glass on "Banking and Currency Reform" (*Cong. Record*, 63 Cong., 1 Sess., 4633-4937, September 10-13, 1913) and at the Jefferson Day celebration in Washington, April 13, 1916, on "Financial Freedom under Woodrow Wilson" (Government Printing Office). Also, see Carter Glass, *An Adventure in Constructive Finance* (Garden City, N. Y., 1927), especially Chaps. IV, VII.

state in which a combination of industrial achievement and a hope for more industrial advancement had enabled business men and railroad attorneys to control the policy of the dominant political organization for many years. John S. Barbour, president of the Virginia-Midland Railroad and afterwards prominent in the Richmond Terminal Company, was for over a decade chairman of the Democratic party in Virginia. He was succeeded by Basil B. Gordon, a reputed millionaire and one of the most wealthy men in the South. Barbour's place in the national Senate and as state political boss was filled by Thomas S. Martin, at the time attorney for the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad. Martin resigned his position as railroad attorney, but State Senator Henry T. Wickham effectively remained as representative of two agricultural counties and also as general counsel of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad, although he had been denounced by the Virginia Farmers' Alliance as early as 1891.⁸⁸

While Virginia had outdistanced most of her Southern sisters in industrial development, the pressure of a third party threat had caused the state Democracy to become more liberal in its economic and social principles. In the latter half of Cleveland's second administration it fostered currency ideas entirely at variance with those of its national leader, but quite in sympathy with the demands of the masses and the reformers. But the traditional and business conservatism of some of the Democratic leaders was not dead, and a large group appeared within the party who were unwilling to accept the "Populistic" ideas of Bryan and Daniel. Although in 1892 no issue appeared which was strong enough to divide the liberals and conservatives who had united to make the party supreme, the removal of the fear of the Force Bill and the intensification of the sound-money controversy forced a split four years later. Some, such as Senators Martin and Wickham remained regular; others, such as Gordon, Logan, and Governor O'Ferrall, bolted the party and vigorously fought for sound money. Most of those who revolted were undoubtedly sincere in their attempts to represent what they considered to be Democratic principles, and most of them later returned to the regular Democratic fold. The fact should not be overlooked that some of the

⁸⁸ *New York Times*, August 19, 1891.

regular Democrats who enthusiastically supported Bryan, afterwards became the most conservative leaders in the state.⁸⁹ But the Palmer-Buckner ticket turned out to be really a decoy, for to the bolters so disturbing were the issues in the immediate contest that all else must be subordinated to prevent what they considered the possible "Crime of 1896."⁹⁰ Their co-operation and support gave unusual respectability and prestige to the opposition which the Democracy faced in Virginia, and one is led to agree with the *New York Times* that without their "assistance the Virginia Republicans could have made but little impression" in the election.⁹¹ On the other hand, while Bryan's liberal stand appealed to many, it is a reasonable conclusion that the plea of party regularity saved the Old Dominion for the regular Democracy.⁹²

⁸⁹ E.g., Senator Thomas S. Martin, H. D. Flood, and Henry T. Wickham.

⁹⁰ *Lexington Rockbridge County News*, May 21, 1896.

⁹¹ *New York Times*, November 7, 1896.

⁹² "Party regularity was a fetish in Virginia, and it was party regularity that gave Bryan the State," said Senator Glass to the writer, November 19, 1934.

Disfranchisement of the Negro in Mississippi

By WILLIAM ALEXANDER MABRY

Political Reconstruction came to an abrupt and violent end in Mississippi in 1875.¹ The "Revolution" of that year placed the control of the state government in the hands of the Democrats—men sworn to preserve the principles of home rule and white supremacy. Proscription of the large Negro vote was the natural result of the white victory. The day of the Carpetbagger and the Scalawag was done, and the leaderless Negroes were prevented by fraud, intimidation, and occasional violence from making their influence felt in politics. A continuous succession of Democratic victories in state elections is ample proof of the effectiveness of these tactics.

For fifteen years it seemed more expedient to control and suppress the Negro vote than to try to reduce it legally. Indeed, the latter course appeared to be impossible. The Fifteenth Amendment forbade any direct political discrimination against the Negroes as a race. The act of Congress readmitting Mississippi to representation included a condition that the electorate of the state, as provided for in the constitution of 1868, should not be restricted. Furthermore, the organic act, framed during Reconstruction, prohibited the imposition of any property or educational qualifications for voting prior to 1885.

Several factors contributed to a change in the prevailing attitude toward the handling of Negro suffrage. For a short time after the overthrow of the Republicans in 1875, some of the leading Democrats, including

¹ This article is based on "The Disfranchisement of the Negro in the South," the author's doctoral dissertation in history at Duke University, accepted by the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in 1933.

L. Q. C. Lamar, hoped for a division among the Negroes on political questions. But by 1881 Lamar concluded that the blacks were more estranged from the whites than ever and that they were not able "to assimilate with our political habitude and methods."²

Not only was there this general feeling that attempts to divide the Negro vote would continue to be futile but there was also a growing resentment against the low ebb of political morality which was traceable to the illegal suppression of a large percentage of the black vote. White election officials, accustomed to cheating Negroes at the polls, were not above cheating whites as well. The situation was later described in the frankest of terms on the floor of the constitutional convention of 1890 by Judge J. J. Chrisman:

Sir, it is no secret that there has not been a full vote and a fair count in Mississippi since 1875—that we have been preserving the ascendancy of the white people by revolutionary methods. In plain words, we have been stuffing the ballot-boxes, committing perjury, and here and there in the state carrying the elections by fraud and violence until the whole machinery for elections was about to rot down. The public conscience revolted. . . . It required no Solomon to see that the ballot-box-stuffer cannot always be relied on to elect the best man to office.³

During the 1880's a movement got under way for a revision of the state constitution, principally with a view to changing the suffrage qualifications. Among other desirable reforms were the election of judges, elimination of excessive private legislation, taxation of corporations, and educational qualifications for jurors. In a general way, too, there was a lingering prejudice against the constitution of 1868 because it was framed not by the group now in control but by Carpetbaggers, Scalawags, and Negroes. To use the language of Judge S. S. Calhoun: "the effrontery of such a collection of irresponsible men undertaking to frame organic law, aroused intense indignation and scorn, which extended beyond the makers to the work and persisted against that constitution as long as it existed."⁴

² J. T. Wallace, *A History of the Negroes of Mississippi from 1865 to 1890* (Clinton, Miss., 1927), 148.

³ Jackson *Clarion-Ledger*, September 11, 1890.

⁴ S. S. Calhoun, "The Causes and Events that Led to the Calling of the Constitutional

Sentiment favorable to a change in the constitution was sufficiently strong by 1886 to induce the legislature to pass a resolution calling a convention. Governor Robert Lowry, however, vetoed the measure on the grounds that it was then inexpedient to take such a step.

Despite this rebuff, an active group kept urging the necessity of remedying the suffrage abuses. In January, 1889, the president of the Mississippi State Bar Association made a strong speech calling attention to the large Negro majority, "unused to the conduct of civil affairs; incapable of understanding the art of government." The malady was a serious one, he pointed out, but the medicine being used was even more dangerous. "The ignoring of plain constitutional and statutory rights, though necessitated by our present surroundings, must ultimate in greater evils than we now seek to avoid unless some remedy be ascertained and supplied."⁵

The Democratic state convention which met in Jackson on July 16, 1889, nominated for governor John M. Stone, a man who was known to favor the calling of a constitutional convention. Also, the party conclave adopted the following resolution: "We recommend that the question of a convention be made an issue before the people in the coming election, so that they may be enlightened by the discussion, and that the Legislature elected govern itself accordingly."⁶

As the campaign progressed it became increasingly evident that the leaders of the Democratic party were not in agreement on the question of changing the constitution in order to deal with the problem of Negro suffrage. Senator James Z. George came out strongly in favor of constitutional changes which would "enable us to maintain a home government under the control of the white people of the state."⁷ On the other hand, Governor Lowry was indifferent, if not antagonistic, toward the idea of a convention. Senator E. C. Walthall likewise objected to a convention as "an unnecessary, expensive, and dangerous experiment."

Convention of 1890," in Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications* (Oxford, etc., 1897-1914; Centenary Series, 1916-1925), VI (1902), 107.

⁵ Jackson *Clarion-Ledger*, January 31, 1889.

⁶ *Ibid.*, July 18, 1889.

⁷ *Ibid.*, October 24, 1889.

Arguments over a new constitution might simply divide the whites and revive the Negro's interest in politics, which, he felt, was then "largely abated." Like a good many other Democrats from predominantly white counties, he did not want "to restrict the elective franchise by imposing on it any conditions which would strike down tens of thousands of the best white Democrats in Mississippi."⁸

The outcome of the November election may be interpreted as a triumph for the advocates of suffrage reform. Stone became governor of the state and, in February, 1890, the legislature issued a call for a constitutional convention to be assembled in Jackson on August 12 of that year.

The newspaper press had been divided on the issue of calling the convention and was still unable to agree as to the probable outcome of its work. The Jackson *Clarion-Ledger* was an ardent supporter of the constitutional reformers, while the Natchez *Daily Democrat* doubted their sincerity and the likelihood that they would accomplish anything of positive value. A running editorial battle ensued.

While Mississippi was preparing for its constitutional convention, a bill of interest to the entire South was introduced in the national House of Representatives. Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts moved to institute Federal supervision of congressional elections. The reason for such a step is not difficult to deduce. Republican leaders, counting heavily on the Southern Negro support during Reconstruction, had recently witnessed the almost complete loss of that block of votes due to the suppressive tactics of the Southern whites. A solid white South had played an important part in the election of Grover Cleveland in 1884. True enough, the Republicans had won the presidential election of 1888, but their position still was none too secure. The congressional election of 1890 promised to be closely contested.

Southern congressmen protested vigorously against this new threat to home rule but could scarcely deny the charge hurled by their Republican opponents that great numbers of Negroes were being illegally deprived of their right to vote. In defense of his measure Lodge asserted:

If any State thinks that any class of citizens is unfit to vote through ignorance

⁸ *Ibid.*, October 31, 1889.

it can disqualify them from voting for State officers or for members of this House. It has but to put an educational qualification into its constitution. But the disqualification like the qualification can not recognize color, and that is the reason that legal methods have never been tried. The negro is not thrust from his rights merely because he is ignorant and unfit to use them, as is constantly charged, but because his skin is black. . . . If all is fair and honest and free in Southern elections this law will interfere with no one, but will demonstrate the fact to the people of the United States.⁹

The Lodge "Force Bill" was passed by the House on July 2, 1890, but the opposition in the Senate was too strong. There, the Republicans seem to have bargained with the Democrats, sacrificing the election bill to secure the passage of the tariff measure which was pending.¹⁰

The threat of Federal intervention in Southern elections seemed to many Mississippians the strongest sort of argument for putting a stop to the illegal tactics used to disfranchise the Negro and for substituting constitutional or statutory provisions to accomplish the same end. Said Judge Calhoun through the columns of the *Clarion-Ledger*:

It will not do to familiarize the federal power with supervision of the ballot in the states. Better to disfranchise one or the other of the races at the South at once. . . . There is no politics at the South save the race question. Her people naturally adhere to any national party which is the least threatening to the encouragement of black dominion.¹¹

In a similar vein, the *Clarion-Ledger* said editorially:

If the force bill now pending in Congress, passes, it is fortunate for Mississippi that she will be able through her Constitutional Convention soon to assemble to put such restrictions on suffrage as to render it largely nugatory and deprive it of much of its power for evil. Other Southern states are not so favorably situated, but the example set by Mississippi can be followed by them if the measures adopted prove adequate to meet the evil.¹²

As the time for the constitutional convention drew near, abstract discussions of the evils of Negro suffrage and the dangers inherent in the "Force Bill" gave way to concrete proposals for restricting the suffrage in the interest of the white race. Newspaper correspondents vied with

⁹ *Congressional Record*, 51 Cong., 1 Sess., 6544 (June 26, 1890).

¹⁰ James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850*, 8 vols. (New York, 1920), VIII, 361.

¹¹ Jackson *Clarion-Ledger*, March 6, 1890.

¹² *Ibid.*, August 7, 1890.

one another in suggesting plans. The principal ones were these: the Australian ballot system; an educational prerequisite for voting; an increased poll tax to be paid before registration; a change in the basis of representation in the legislature, whereby to vest the real governing power in the white counties; a property qualification for voting; plural voting by property holders; woman suffrage; longer residence requirements for voting; and examination and certification of fitness for voting by a commission. One thing was clear at the outset, none of the plans embraced a simple panacea for the state's political ills, and effecting an agreement in the convention was not going to be easy. The *Daily Democrat* branded all the proposals as motivated by "expediency, by which an advantage is to be gained by one class of citizenship of the commonwealth over another."¹³

The Negroes of Mississippi were by no means oblivious to the major purpose for which the convention was called. About the middle of June, Negro Republican delegates from forty counties held a meeting in Jackson, and a committee prepared an address to President Benjamin Harrison protesting against the suppression of the colored vote. A bold indictment of the whites of the state and their motives was made:

. . . it is not due to an apprehension that the blacks would dominate the whites that fraud and violence are resorted to in popular elections in this state. It is due, however, to a well-formed apprehension, that but for the inauguration and enforcement of such methods the Democratic party would be defeated.¹⁴

To the Negroes of the state was issued a warning that the Democrats were preparing, through means of the constitutional convention, to shape the election law to their own needs and then "the policy of crushing out the manhood of the Negro citizens is to be carried on to success." The Negroes in all counties were urged to organize and elect delegates to the convention to forestall the plans of the Democrats.¹⁵

Despite the action taken by the Negro gathering in Jackson, the

¹³ Natchez *Daily Democrat*, April 13, 1890.

¹⁴ Jackson *Clarion-Ledger*, July 4, 1890.

¹⁵ J. S. McNeilly, "History of the Measures Submitted to the Committee on Elective Franchise, Apportionment, and Elections in the Constitutional Convention of 1890," in Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications*, VI (1902), 132.

Democrats had no difficulty in electing an overwhelming majority to seats in the constitutional convention. Of the 135 men who assembled in Jackson on August 12, 1890, only 2 were genuinely Republican. Both of these were from Bolivar County—G. P. Melchoir (white) and Isaiah T. Montgomery, formerly a slave of Joseph E. Davis, brother of the Confederate president, but now one of the wealthiest Negro planters and business men in the state. Former Governor James L. Alcorn and Judge H. F. Simrall, erstwhile leading Republicans, were elected to the convention by the Democrats. Four delegates were classed as Independents—the rest as Democrats.

Not all of the vast Democratic majority were of one mind. One soon begins to hear of "black belt" Democrats and "white county" Democrats. The two groups agreed in wanting to see the Negroes disfranchised but differed as to method. Delegates from the white counties feared that any drastic suffrage restrictions involving educational tests might deprive a great many unlettered whites, as well as Negroes, of the right to vote. On the other hand, the black belt representatives were willing to sacrifice the illiterate white vote in order to accomplish the major goal—the disfranchisement of the Negro.

After a close contest between the Democratic factions, Judge Calhoon of Hinds County, in the black belt, was chosen chairman of the convention. His opening address made quite clear his own position and that of his section with respect to Negro suffrage. Said Chairman Calhoon:

You are confronted by a colossal fact which cannot be obscured by the clouds of maudlin sentiment or pseudo philanthropy. . . . This ballot system must be so arranged as to effect one object, permit me to say—for we find the two races now together, the rule of one of which has always meant economic and moral ruin; we find another race whose rule has always meant prosperity and happiness to all races. What does the instinct of self-protection require us to do? We have been twenty-five long years endeavoring to have strictly homologous political relations between those races. We have failed.¹⁶

The first practical question which faced the convention was the extent of its powers. Did it have the authority to restrict the suffrage when the act of Congress readmitting Mississippi to the Union specifically pro-

¹⁶ Mississippi Constitutional Convention *Journal*, 1890 (Jackson, 1890), 10.

vided that no citizen permitted to vote by the state constitution of 1868 should ever be denied that privilege except as punishment for crime? If this act of Congress was constitutional the hands of the convention were tied.

This perplexing problem was submitted to a committee of lawyers headed by Wiley P. Harris. The verdict of the committee was that Congress had exceeded its constitutional powers when it imposed such a condition upon the state of Mississippi. Congress could not exact, even of a new state, any conditions which necessitated a surrender of its rights as a state. The Federal compact had guaranteed the equality of all the states in the Union. The power of regulating the franchise had been given to the states; they had customarily exercised that power without question. Since the adoption of the Fifteenth Amendment, states could no longer disfranchise on grounds of race, color, or previous condition of servitude; otherwise they were free to limit the suffrage as they might choose.¹⁷ The convention accepted the opinion of its advisory committee and proceeded with its work.

But all the obstacles had not been surmounted. How was a suffrage clause to be framed which would effectively disfranchise the majority of Negroes and, at the same time, not violate the Fifteenth Amendment or disqualify large numbers of whites from voting? Furthermore, there was the possibility of having the state's representation in Congress reduced under the operation of the Fourteenth Amendment if the state's electorate were decreased. Such was the difficult task entrusted to the Committee on Elective Franchise, Apportionment, and Elections.

Many believed it impossible to find a legal solution to Mississippi's suffrage dilemma. Of this opinion was the *Daily Democrat*:

Some are hoping for a new and undiscovered solution of the suffrage question, but these will be disappointed, as time and circumstances have not yet exhumed the key to any solution outside the old Democratic methods—so that the convention can only proceed with the best light it has in purifying and making sure and substantial a consistent adherence to those methods.¹⁸

¹⁷ Frank Johnston, "Suffrage and Reconstruction in Mississippi," in Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications*, VI (1902), 215-16.

¹⁸ Natchez *Daily Democrat*, August 12, 1890.

The thirty-six members of the Committee on Elective Franchise, Apportionment, and Elections were named equally from the white and black counties, with the chairmanship going to Robert C. Patty of Noxubee (a white county). Senator George and Judge Calhoun essayed to play the rôle of conciliators in the committee sessions.

The question of representation of counties in the legislature was taken up first. The preponderance of power heretofore had lain with the block of counties west of the Illinois Central Railway—the black belt.¹⁹ Representation was based on total population, and the large number of Negroes swelled the population of these counties. But comparatively few Negroes voted, so the whites of the black belt had had more than their proportionate share of power in the state government. This situation the white county delegates were anxious to see changed. Their aspirations fitted in nicely with the plan of Senator George to assure a continuance of white supremacy in the state by giving the predominance in the legislature to the white counties.²⁰

The “conscientious objectors” to this gerrymander were naturally the whites of the black belt. Senator George himself said that the reapportionment of representation was not the plan he would approve for a “homogeneous free people, the main body of whom are capable of self-government.”²¹ He regretted to disturb the legislative apportionment but felt that such a step was “‘demanded by the fundamental necessity of the situation.’”²² And his influence in the committee was strong enough to overcome black belt objections and secure the inclusion of a provision for legislative reapportionment in the committee report.

Black belt sentiment had originally favored some such certain method of cutting down the Negro vote as the confusing South Carolina “Eight-Box Law”²³ But this type of legislation could not be carried because of the fear of the white counties that white votes also would be sacrificed

¹⁹ Johnston, “Suffrage and Reconstruction in Mississippi,” in *loc. cit.*, 221.

²⁰ Jackson *Clarion-Ledger*, July 10, 1890.

²¹ Natchez *Daily Democrat*, July 9, 1890.

²² McNeilly, “History of the Measures Submitted to the Committee on Elective Franchise, Apportionment, and Elections,” in *loc. cit.*, 134.

²³ Jackson *Clarion-Ledger*, February 20, 1890.

thereby. A literacy test with the "understanding clause" as a loophole for illiterate whites was proposed by Harris of Hinds County, and accepted by the committee as a compromise.

On September 2 Chairman Patty of the Committee on Elective Franchise, Apportionment, and Elections read his report to the convention. Briefly, it provided that in order to vote one must be at least twenty-one years of age and sane. He must have resided in the state for two years and in the election district one year, must have been registered, and must never have been convicted of bribery, burglary, theft, arson, obtaining money under false pretenses, perjury, forgery, embezzlement, murder, or bigamy. Also, to vote one must have paid a poll tax of two dollars on or before February 1, for the current year and for the year previous. Section five embraced the new compromise plan—the "understanding clause." Qualified voters must be able, on and after January 1, 1896, "to read any section of the state constitution; or to be able to understand the same when read to him, or give a reasonable interpretation thereof." A new registration was to be made after these conditions were applied.²⁴

Provision was made that, for future elections, printed ballots be furnished by the state. Voting stalls or tables were to be private, and a maximum of ten minutes was to be allowed for a voter to mark and deposit his ticket. A voter might secure the aid of the election inspector in marking his ballot only if blind or otherwise physically disabled. If more names were marked than there were officers to be elected the vote was to be thrown out.²⁵

Exceedingly important was the section dealing with legislative apportionment. The representation of no county was reduced, but the number of representatives in the lower house of the legislature was increased by thirteen. The additional seats were allotted to the white counties, and several legislative districts were organized out of the white sections of the black counties.²⁶

Another part of the scheme proposed by the committee was the so-

²⁴ Mississippi Constitutional Convention *Journal*, 1890, pp. 134-36.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 136-39.

called electoral plan, taken largely from the suggestion of Edward Mayes. The benefits of gerrymandering were to be carried to the limit. The governor was not to be elected by direct popular vote, but indirectly by an electoral college scheme. The popular votes cast in each county were to be counted, and the candidate receiving a majority was to be given as many electoral votes as the county had members in the legislature. Also, the governor was empowered to appoint the judges.²⁷

The debate in the convention on the committee report was long and sometimes bitter, bringing out into bold relief the sectional feeling which existed in the state. The extreme white county sentiment was expressed in a speech by W. A. Boyd of Tippah County. He was glad to reform the suffrage if not a single white voter was to be sacrificed; political rights were inherent so far as whites were concerned. The convention had no power, he asserted, to disfranchise because of poverty or illiteracy. The black belt was only trying to legislate the state into aristocracy. "You are driving the wedge that shall forever destroy white unity in Mississippi," thundered Boyd.²⁸

J. B. Boothe of Panola County, a black belt delegate, answered him with a threat to oppose the apportionment scheme which was clearly advantageous to the white counties. However, he appealed for cooperation and understanding between the sections of the state.

I want to say for the benefit of my friends in the white counties, that it is not safe for them to quiet themselves and dream of white supremacy, peace, and prosperity, good government, and low taxation, whatever may come of their brethren in the black counties. Their destiny is your destiny. . . .²⁹

J. H. McGehee of Franklin County chided his fellow white county delegates for their reluctance to sacrifice a few illiterate white voters. The whites of Mississippi, he said, were like a superior army facing a weaker, yet hesitating to attack for fear of losing a few men. Some members of the convention were simply afraid to disfranchise a few

²⁷ McNeilly, "History of the Measures Submitted to the Committee on Elective Franchise, Apportionment, and Elections," in *loc. cit.*, 135.

²⁸ Jackson *Clarion-Ledger*, September 18, 1890.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

whites because their constituents might say, "I'll vote agin him next time he runs for office."³⁰

Numbers of the black belt delegates were dissatisfied with the committee report. W. B. Eskridge of Tallahatchie County feared the proposed plan was not adequate to prevent the Negroes from voting for any considerable length of time. Also, he believed that the "understanding clause" should be rejected because it would only lead to trickery and fraud. "Adopt this qualification and it places in the hands of the officer who is to apply the test the power to defraud and disfranchise."³¹ F. K. Winchester of Adams County protested against the apportionment arrangement. Too much advantage was given to the white counties; it appeared to him that all the concessions had to come from his side of the house—the black counties.³² But there were others like Thomas P. Bell of Kemper County who regretted the expressions of jealousy between the sections. "We are embarked in the same ship of white supremacy, and it is freighted with all our hopes." He approved the committee report—concessions, compromises, and all—because "it places the commonwealth of Mississippi for all time in control of the white race—the only race fit to govern in this country—yet it does no injustice to the other race."³³

Considering such frank expressions from members of the dominant race, it is interesting to note the attitude of Montgomery—the sole Negro member of the convention. In a speech which elicited widespread attention and many favorable comments, he expressed himself as favoring the committee report. In so doing he was not unaware that it would exact "a fearful sacrifice" on the part of his own race. He estimated that the educational test if administered honestly, would disfranchise about 123,334 Negroes and only 11,889 whites, leaving a white voting majority of more than 40,000 in the state instead of the existing 70,000 potential Negro majority. True enough, the Negro majority was already being repressed by "blood-shed, bribery, ballot-stuffing"—a condition at

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*, September 25, 1890.

³³ *Ibid.*, September 11, 1890.

which "the good people of Mississippi stand aghast." He also recognized that the proposed legislative apportionment scheme would give the white counties a majority of at least fourteen members in the House of Representatives and three members in the Senate. These sacrifices he was willing to make in behalf of the Negroes in order "to restore confidence, the great missing link between the two races; to restore honesty and purity to the ballot-box and to confer the great boon of political liberty upon the Commonwealth of Mississippi." Continuing, he said:

Sirs, we are all well aware that our race has not yet attained the high plane of moral, intellectual and political excellence common to yours, but it is our privilege to press onward and upward. We accord you a generous meed of praise for the assistance you have afforded but you have suffered your prejudice to set the bounds and limits to our progress.

His principal plea was for an impartial application of the new suffrage provisions and for a restoration of confidence and good will between the white and colored races.³⁴

During the course of the debate, two amendments were added to the report of the committee. R. H. Taylor of Panola County secured the passage of an amendment to section five to the effect that the educational qualification be put in force January 1, 1892, instead of four years later. This amendment the *Clarion-Ledger* called the "saving clause" in the entire suffrage article. "He has placed in the power of the Democrats to elect their Congressmen without federal interference, and insured Democratic success in Mississippi."³⁵ Also, a uniform two-dollar poll tax was substituted for a two-dollar tax which might be raised to three at the discretion of the county board of supervisors.³⁶

The newspaper press of the state followed closely the handling of the suffrage question by the convention, and much of the criticism was unfavorable. The features of the committee report especially objected to were the legislative apportionment plan and the "understanding clause." The apportionment scheme seemed to the *Clarion-Ledger* to be inherently unfair. The twenty-nine black counties paid two thirds of the

³⁴ New York *World*, September 27, 1890.

³⁵ Jackson *Clarion-Ledger*, September 25, 1890.

³⁶ Johnston, "Suffrage and Reconstruction in Mississippi," in *loc. cit.*, 222.

taxes, their population was several thousand greater than the remaining forty-six counties; yet they were given sixty-two representatives, while the white counties were to have sixty-eight. Furthermore, the salaries of thirteen new representatives and five new senators would increase the annual legislative expenses some \$12,500. "Oh, how the Democrats of the State would howl if the increase in the Senate and the House was done by a Republican convention. It is an unnecessary and expensive measure."³⁷

The *Daily Democrat*, too, regarded the apportionment plan as "altogether unnecessary and wrong." However, contrary to its earlier hostile attitude toward the convention, it now characterized the new suffrage requirements and the required use of the Australian ballot system as "fair and liberal, antagonizing no principle, depriving no one unjustly of his rights, and in no respect in violation of the state's Federal relations."³⁸

Many editors doubted the wisdom of the "understanding clause." The *Clarion-Ledger* bolstered its own opposition with quotations from a dozen or more local papers. Section five of the franchise article was variously dubbed as the "odious section five," "a shameless fraud," "a legal blot," and "the fly-blown section."³⁹ Said the *Vicksburg Post*:

That a lot of politicians, fertile in tricks, could concoct this scheme is not inconceivable; but that a man who aspires to statesmanship, can cheat his conscience and impose the delusion upon his mind, that such a measure can bring anything but mischief and disaster is simply incredible.⁴⁰

Despite the adverse criticisms voiced on the floor of the convention and through the press, the suffrage and apportionment articles were accepted by the Committee of the Whole on September 18, and the completed constitution was ratified by the convention on November 1. Though many members had opposed individual features of the constitution, there was a rather general feeling that the document was the best that could be framed under the circumstances. On the final count only eight negative votes were cast.

³⁷ Jackson *Clarion-Ledger*, September 25, 1890.

³⁸ Natchez *Daily Democrat*, September 6, 1890.

³⁹ Jackson *Clarion-Ledger*, October 9, 1890.

⁴⁰ Vicksburg *Post*, quoted in *ibid.*, October 9, 1890.

In summing up the work of the convention, Chairman Calhoun said:

Our mission here has been accomplished as best it could be upon adjustment of the various opinions and interests of the different sections of Mississippi. Restricted by the Federal Constitution, we have tried to secure a more enlightened franchise without discrimination or injustice. . . . There is but one sovereign by divine right. That sovereign is mind. I look in vain for any instance of African contribution to the disclosure of undiscovered truths tending to ameliorate the individual or social condition of man.⁴¹

The new constitution was not submitted to the electorate for approval but, as had been decided some months earlier, was promulgated by the convention. Though there was ample precedent in the state's history for such a procedure, the *Daily Democrat* could not refrain from commenting that the convention either considered the people "incapable of forming a correct estimate of what they want in the construction of a government" or that it feared popular rejection of its work.⁴²

Though the educational test was not to be applied until 1892, almost immediate results from the adoption of the new constitution were evident. White Mississippi had spoken in no uncertain terms; delegates on the floor of the convention had openly proclaimed their intention of disfranchising the Negroes. The moral effect of this was enormous. Three days after the constitution was approved by the convention, the regular state election was held. There were no reported disturbances or charges of intimidation or fraud, yet only about 30 per cent of the normal Negro vote was cast. The *Daily Democrat* ventured the assertion that the Negroes were now "looking after their material interests and domestic betterment and leaving politics alone."⁴³ That was precisely what the whites of the state hoped they would do and, in fact, intended to make them do.

A survey of the Mississippi constitution of 1890 reveals no direct disfranchisement of the Negro. The Fifteenth Amendment precluded any open discrimination against the blacks as a race. Yet one can scarcely read the debates of the convention and the press discussions without

⁴¹ Mississippi Constitutional Convention *Journal*, 1890, pp. 700-701.

⁴² Natchez *Daily Democrat*, September 7, 1890.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, November 6, 1890.

concluding that the intention of those in authority was to accomplish by indirect means what the Federal Constitution forbade doing directly. The predominance of power in the legislature was given to the white counties because white control of the state could be assured thereby. Payment of a poll tax was made a prerequisite of voting largely because it was believed that the white man was more apt to pay it than the Negro. A literacy test was imposed because the rate of illiteracy was higher among Negroes than among whites. Then too, registration officials were given wide discretionary powers in determining one's ability to read or understand a section of the constitution. Here was an opportunity for almost unlimited partiality, and a white Democratic official would scarcely be partial to a Republican Negro. One correspondent of the *Clarion-Ledger* wrote that he would be glad to furnish for a dollar a dozen copies of the new constitution "written in French and warranted not to be understood by a Negro."⁴⁴ In short, the convention evolved a constitution which discriminated not against the Negro but against his characteristics and his limitations.

The movement to disfranchise the Negro through a revision of the state constitution occasioned considerable friction within the Democratic ranks. This was true not because any considerable group wished to protect the political rights of the Negro, but because Negro suffrage had produced a more acute problem in the black belt than in the section of the state which was predominantly white. Also, the rewriting of the constitution afforded an opportunity for the sections to maneuver for control of the state government through legislative reapportionment. As for the individual members of the convention, it appears that some were sincerely interested in improving the political morality of the state, while others were equally determined to exploit the Negro question for their personal or sectional aggrandizement. Be that as it may, the Mississippi constitutional convention of 1890 had substituted a more orderly and apparently a more legal method of disfranchising the Negro in place of the old system of force and fraud. Other Southern states were soon to do likewise.

⁴⁴ Jackson *Clarion-Ledger*, October 9, 1890.

The Jefferson Birthday Dinner, 1830

By RICHARD R. STENBERG

Historians have customarily pictured the Jefferson Birthday Dinner of April 13, 1830, as a nullification affair instigated by Vice-President John C. Calhoun with design to commit President Andrew Jackson to the nullification theory. This traditional view arose, rather naturally, from the famous (but very misleading) and clarion toast offered by Jackson at the Dinner, from Jackson's more or less successful attempt to discredit Calhoun by his campaign of anti-Calhoun propaganda and misrepresentations, and from Jackson's annihilation of Calhoun's immediate political ambitions.¹ A survey of contemporary evidence, however, reveals the Birthday Dinner in a different and less sinister light; and tends to place Jackson and Van Buren, rather than Calhoun, in an unfavorable view. The historical student would do well occasionally to recall Lord Acton's protest against that natural human tendency to sanctify success and might as against right that is so forgetful of and deadening to critical and moral standards.

The background of the Jefferson Birthday Party should be briefly noted. The protective tariff of 1828, calculated to surfeit the Northern, protectionist wing of the heterogeneous Jacksonian party, was passed, as Calhoun afterwards remarked, by "the vote of Mr V. B. [Van Buren], Col Benton and his other friends" and was the "measure which gave Genl Jackson's administration a false direction" and to which "all the

¹ This view of the Jefferson Birthday Dinner as a Calhounian, nullification affair was also insinuated in aftertimes by Thomas Hart Benton, in his *Thirty Years' View*, 2 vols. (New York, 1854-1856), I, 138, 141-42, 148; and Benton's work had some little influence on American historiography. Misrepresenting the affair in his late account, Benton too modestly omits mention of his own prominent part therein.

disasters, which have befallen the country and the party may be distinctly traced."² The Southern leaders expected a reduction of the tariff from Jackson's election—but Jackson, anxious to retain his Northern political support, had no notion of accepting the Southern point of view. His decision by December, 1829 (if not, as seems probable, much earlier),³ to advance the presidential aspirations of Van Buren as against those of Calhoun strengthened his private determination to pay no great heed to the Southern outcry against the protective tariff. Jackson was an astute and consummate politician, with no equal in his day save the Little Magician of New York. Jackson greatly resented Calhoun's natural assumption, after the election of 1828, to the rôle of heir apparent to the presidency—and resented this particularly after he, Jackson, had soon privately responded agreeably to his friends' request that he stand for re-election. Thus on the eve of the Webster-Hayne debate of January-February, 1830, Jackson was already secretly hostile towards Calhoun.

In the famous debate on Foote's resolution Webster sought to defend the tariff against the threatening coalition of South and West which Benton and Hayne were endeavoring to form against the East. This coalition, which was to be grounded on a program of opposition to the protective tariff and internal improvements, was intended to include the Northwest, leaving New England politically stranded. Cleverly ignoring Benton, who had begun the assault on the East, Webster found it convenient to attack the nullification views that had recently appeared in South Carolina, disingenuously imputing disunionism to them. Webster did not speak at Calhoun, whose connection with the nullification theory was not yet publicly known,⁴ though he did warn the Vice-

² Calhoun to George McDuffie, December 4, 1843, in J. Franklin Jameson (ed.), *The Correspondence of John C. Calhoun*, in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1899, II, 552.

³ Jackson to John Overton, December 31, 1829, in James Parton, *Life of Andrew Jackson*, 3 vols. (New York, 1859-1860), III, 293-95. Cf. *Reminiscences of James A. Hamilton* (New York, 1869), 89, 101.

⁴ A Washington correspondent wrote on February 11, 1830: "Mr. Webster charged upon them [South Carolinians] a revolution in their doctrines and practices. The Vice President in a very distinct and a respectful manner, inquired of the Senator . . . if he intended to impute to him the change or discrepancy alleged? Mr. W. replied, also in the most respectful manner, 'No sir; for two reasons: one that you are not in a situation to

President privately that, if the South persistently attacked the North, Van Buren would underhandedly seek his ruin. As a rival to Calhoun, Van Buren had long since been seeking the Carolinian's ruin. In truth, the South Carolina Exposition and other such pronouncements were merely protests, comparable to the earlier Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions.

Jackson, who had always been a state rights advocate (so appearing noticeably in the matter of Georgia versus the Indians), privately commended Hayne's speeches;⁵ and would undoubtedly have sided with the Southerners on the tariff had it not been for his secret desire to straddle that issue to retain his Northern political following and for his (as yet secret) favoritism toward Van Buren and hostility toward Calhoun. The President, who had already threatened to remove Calhoun's friends from the cabinet (in January, 1830) and who was soon to quarrel openly with Calhoun (in May, 1830),⁶ was at the time of the Jefferson Birthday Dinner apparently looking for pretexts to quarrel with Calhoun—in order to kill him politically as an obstacle to his political plans, which included the retention of the protective tariff and the eventual elevation of Van Buren to the presidency. Since 1827 Van Buren and his friends and allies had been doing everything possible to sidetrack and eliminate Calhoun; Van Buren seized every opportunity to arouse and stimulate Jackson's suspicion and hostility towards Calhoun. That Van Buren was

participate in the debate; the other, that I have no cause to suppose that there is the slightest foundation for such an imputation in regard to you. . . . I was present, after the Senate had adjourned, when the Vice President went to the seat of Mr. Webster, and openly proclaimed that since the term of his service in the House of Representatives, his sentiments had undergone *no* change; and wished it universally understood. . . . Mr. Webster said, he so had understood, and never intended to convey an idea to the contrary." *Baltimore Commercial Chronicle and Daily Marylander*, February 18, 1830. Benton also said: "Mr. Calhoun had not then uncovered his position in relation to nullification." Benton did not, as he states, believe in a design to resist the tariff forcibly until November, 1832. *Thirty Years' View*, I, 142; Thomas H. Benton, *Abridgement of the Debates of Congress, from 1789 to 1856*, 16 vols. (New York, 1857-1861), X, 449 n.

Indeed, Calhoun's lifelong policy was to restrain the South Carolina hotheads. He wrote a friend on January 7, 1829, that in spite of the South's outcry against the tariff of 1828 he did "not doubt the attachment of that section to the Union." Calhoun MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

⁵ Theodore D. Jervay, *Robert Y. Hayne and His Times* (New York, 1909), 339-40; Cicero W. Harris, *The Sectional Struggle* (Philadelphia, 1902), 331.

⁶ R. R. Stenberg, "Jackson's 'Rhea Letter' Hoax," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), II (1936), 480-96.

largely deceiving and duping Southerners in his pretenses of being politically sympathetic toward them was perceived by some observers. One wrote in February, 1830: "Van Buren, while cheering them with hope of future reward, is secretly pulling the strings to sink them irretrievably. . . . The Vice-President already sees and feels that he is *debors du combat*. He goes about taking one and another by the hand, tries to look cheerful and manly, . . . but it is all in vain, situated as he is between two fires."⁷ Such was the Jacksonian background—so generally overlooked in discussions—of the Jefferson Birthday Party of April 13, 1830.

The contemporary evidence shows that Calhoun had nothing to do with the origin and conduct of the Jefferson Birthday Dinner, and that the affair was but a "love feast" projected by Benton and Hayne and others, but by Benton primarily, to consolidate and cement the alliance of South and West which they had inaugurated. They wished publicly to ground this alliance, and its strict-constructionist, antitariff, and anti-internal improvements program, upon the political principles of Jefferson.⁸ In short, it was a far cry from a Calhounian nullification conspiracy! Benton (who was at this time a much closer friend of Van Buren than he was of Calhoun, though he was amicable toward the South Carolinian as late as 1833) was the master mover and planner behind the celebration, and was chairman of the committee which solicited twenty-four "regular" toasts beforehand from intended guests and which published a list of the toasts, thus gathered, before the party was held.⁹ That Benton was the prime author of the Birthday Dinner was generally known, as appears from comments on the fact in newspapers of the day. *Niles' Register* observed: "The chief cook' was Mr. *Benton*, of Missouri—it

⁷ Washington correspondent, in Boston *Columbian Sentinel*, February 10, 1830.

⁸ While as late as 1831 Calhoun was hoping to construct a national party under his own leadership with internal improvements as one plank in his platform. See Frederic Bancroft, *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement* (Baltimore, 1928), 103-104; J. Franklin Jameson (ed.), "Letters on the Nullification Movement in South Carolina," in the *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), VI (1900), 741-45.

⁹ Benton wrote N. P. Trist on April 12, 1830: "Being one of the committee on Toasts for Mr. Jefferson's anniversary, I have to apprise you that the last of the regular toasts, the 24th, will be personal to the family of Mr. Jefferson . . . When this toast is given the occasion will admit, and perhaps require, a few words from Mr. T. J. Randolph, if present; if not from yourself." Trist MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

seemed as if the whole affair rested on his broad shoulders—and his chief aids were Messrs. P. P. Barbour, Woodbury, Hayne and Grundy. We believed it was *gotten-up* for effect against internal improvements and the protection of manufactures."¹⁰ The *Washington Banner of the Constitution* believed likewise and saw a party movement in it, not a nullification conspiracy.¹¹ Senator Webster wrote similarly:

The dinner of the 13th was not only a failure, but has given great offense. The Penn[sylvani]a members, having before dinner, obtained a sight of the toasts, seceded in a body. . . . The object of those who originated the proceedings of the 13th was to give a state right anti Tariff tone and character to the whole party. It was to found the party on *Southern* principles, and such principles as should exclude, not only their avowed political opponents, but Mr. Van Buren's friends also.

Webster added, significantly: "The President means to be re-elected. He *has* meant so, all along. Seeing this, V. B. has been persuading him to do so."¹²

It was observed at the time that of those who planned and attended the Birthday Dinner very few were nullifiers.¹³ This was quite apparent

¹⁰ *Niles' Weekly Register* (Baltimore, 1811-1849), XL (1831), 192; cf. *ibid.*, XXXVIII (1830), 154. The *Boston Courier* inquired: "Can any person tell why Mr. Benton concluded to celebrate the 13th of April as the birthday of Mr. Jefferson in preference to any other day in the year? Mr. Jefferson, in his Memoir of himself, does not tell the time of his birth." Quoted in *ibid.*, 255. The Philadelphia *National Gazette* spoke on April 22, 1830, of "Colonel Benton's Dinner," and again on May 4 of the "Jeffersonian (alias Bentonian) public dinner." The Charleston *Courier* was similarly advised from Washington, and said on April 21, 1830: "Mr. Benton, of the Senate, and Mr. Desha, of the House, seem to have been the first and prominent movers in the business."

¹¹ Quoted in *Niles' Weekly Register*, XL (1831), 192.

¹² Webster to Clay, April 18, 1830, in Clay MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); partially published in J. Franklin Jameson (ed.), *The Writings and Speeches of Daniel Webster*, 18 vols. (National Edition, Boston, 1903), XVI, 195-96. Upon withdrawing from the dinner, the Pennsylvanian delegation "assembled at the room of one of their number, and 'toasted the Tariff and Internal Improvements in brimming glasses,'" according to a Washington correspondent. Charleston *Courier*, April 29, 1830. An observer wrote as early as December 7, 1828, of President-elect Jackson: "His friends in Tennessee say he must continue for eight years, and whoever goes into his Cabinet must go with the expectation that he is to be re-elected." John E. Wool to Francis Baylies, Washington, December 7, 1828, in *Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings* (Boston, 1791-), XLVI (1912-1913), 327.

¹³ Milledgeville *Georgia Journal*, quoted in *Niles' Weekly Register*, XXXVIII (1830), 352. In an early number of the *Washington Globe*, which paper President Jackson was soon to establish to replace the *United States Telegraph* as his official organ, it was as-

even in the personnel of the several committees which completed arrangements for the affair. The committee on toasts was comprised of Benton of Missouri, George M. Troup of Georgia, and Warren R. Davis of South Carolina. The committee on invitations consisted of Hugh L. White of Tennessee, Robert Y. Hayne of South Carolina, Levi Woodbury of New Hampshire, Thomas H. Hall of North Carolina, Joel Yancey of Kentucky, and Churchill C. Cambreleng of New York. The committee on arrangements was made up of James M. Wayne of Georgia, Robert Desha of Tennessee, Henry Hubbard of New Hampshire, Thomas Hinds of Mississippi, and Daniel H. Miller of Pennsylvania.¹⁴ Alluding to Benton's object, *Niles' Register* observed that the absence of many Western congressmen from the Dinner "caused no small portion of dismay, and marred the *effect* of the whole thing."¹⁵

Benton himself immediately afterwards wrote and published a narrative of the proceedings of the Jefferson Birthday Dinner, in which, as an onlooker remarked, he "apparently resolved that a due record of himself should be made."¹⁶ One looks in vain through the many toasts recorded in Benton's narrative for any hint of nullification doctrines, though Jeffersonian strict-constructionist, state rights, antitariff and anti-internal improvements views were freely expressed. On April 17 Benton sent to the *United States Telegraph* an addendum to his narrative, including a toast from John Randolph which had reached him too late to be read at the Dinner, remarking that it gave him satisfaction to connect "the name of the matador of the *old* Republican party" with the Dinner of the new.¹⁷

serted that the Jefferson Birthday Dinner had been a nullification proceeding; whereupon *Niles' Weekly Register*, XL (1831), 192, at once proceeded to correct the *Globe's* partisan "error" and place the Birthday Dinner in its true light.

¹⁴ Concord *New Hampshire Patriot and State Gazette*, April 26, 1830; Washington *National Intelligencer*, April 13, 1830.

¹⁵ *Niles' Weekly Register*, XXXVIII (1830), 154.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* Benton's narrative of the proceedings was published in the Washington *United States Telegraph*, April 17, 1830; reprinted in the Washington *National Intelligencer*, April 20, 1830. Benton toasted Nathaniel Macon of North Carolina, an old friend of the Benton family.

¹⁷ Washington *National Intelligencer*, April 21, 1830; Washington *United States Telegraph*, April 19, 1830. The *Telegraph* had stated on April 8, on first announcing the plan to hold a Democratic-Republican celebration on Jefferson's approaching birthday: "About

Benton's lengthy speech at the Dinner reveals the purpose behind the celebration—namely, to demonstrate that Southern and Western interests were mutually in accord with Jeffersonian principles. Barbour of Virginia having spoken for the South, Benton rose and spoke expressly for "the West." The Missouri Senator observed during his speech:

I look upon this celebration as a solemn recurrence to fundamental principles, and a declaration of adhesion to the republican doctrines of the great apostle of American liberty. . . . This is the beginning only, the first in a series and multiplication of celebrations, which the friends and admirers of Jefferson will cherish and perpetuate, for the double object of shewing honor to him and preserving his principles for themselves.

The Jacksonian background of the Jeffersonian Birthday Dinner has been briefly noted. When, a few days before the Dinner, the list of regular toasts solicited by Benton's committee appeared in print, Van Buren at once hastened with it to President Jackson and suggested—as he himself inadvertently confessed in his *Autobiography*—that the approaching Dinner was *a nullification proceeding instigated by Calhoun!*¹⁸ Anxious to incite Jackson to strike a blow at his—and also Jackson's—rival, he suggested to Jackson "the safety and propriety of virtually assuming [!] by the character of the toast to be proposed by the President that the proceedings and ceremonies of the day were portentous of danger to the Union," and urged Jackson to present himself in his toast as the "abrupt and defiant . . . ready guardian and Champion" of the Union against Calhoun! A more machiavellian scheme could scarcely have been conceived. Jackson, eager to attack Calhoun on any pretext, readily fell in with the plan. Neither Jackson nor Van Buren at this time (and perhaps ever) believed the Union to be threatened by Calhoun,¹⁹ nor could they really have in the least believed the approaching

ninety members of Congress have united in this celebration"—namely, "friends and admirers of the Democratic Republican principles of Thomas Jefferson." This announcement of April 8 was probably written by Benton himself for the *Telegraph*; its phraseology is almost identical with phraseology found in Benton's speech at the Dinner.

¹⁸ J. C. Fitzpatrick (ed.), *The Autobiography of Martin Van Buren*, in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1918, II, 412-15.

¹⁹ Van Buren himself stated: "When I left for England in August 1831, Mr. Calhoun had just committed himself, in a long and laboured *exposé*, to the doctrine of nullification." *Ibid.*, 541. Jackson about the same time remarked, in writing Van Buren on September 5,

Dinner in any sense a Calhounian affair, as its real origin was apparent and as they were both constant and astute observers of public political trends and occurrences. In short, Jackson's well-known toast, "The Federal Union—it must be preserved," instigated by the ambitious schemer Van Buren, was in reality aimed by them not at a preservation of the Union, which no one believed in danger, but simply at the political extinction of Calhoun, whose ambitions and political principles stood in the way of their plans for their own further political preferment. The disunionism implicitly assumed in Calhoun by Jackson, at Van Buren's suggestion, was a gratuitous slur and was certainly not actually believed by those adroit and deceptive political intriguers. The full story of Jackson's unjust persecution of and warfare upon Calhoun—which was almost entirely actuated by personal political motives, and of which Jackson's toast at the Jefferson Birthday Party was a fair sample—remains yet to be fully told. Calhoun was naturally astonished at the unwarranted toast which Jackson unmistakably directed at him during the Dinner—but this display of Jackson's personal hostility doubtless prepared him to receive with no great astonishment Jackson's unprovoked attack upon him in May, 1830, on a new pretext.

Calhoun from 1828 until his death sought to restrain the South Carolina fire-eaters, though this fact was not altogether evident at all times to his contemporaries. He probably advanced with South Carolina into nullification as a political reality in 1831-1832 largely in reaction to Jackson's persecution of him and his friends and in anger at Jackson's "treason" to his own section in the tariff matter. Jackson was, indeed, as it seems, a politician to the core, to whom the personal prestige and advancement of himself and his favorites was very often more important than the interests of the country and principles of fair and honest dealing where the two planes crossed and conflicted—though, to be sure, Jackson found it no difficult task to identify his own personal

1831, that Calhoun's recent nullification letter had exposed him and that he was "now understood" and consequently "harmless." J. S. Bassett (ed.), *The Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, 7 vols. (Washington, 1926-1935), IV, 346. As above noted, there was no publicly known basis in April, 1830, for fixing responsibility upon Calhoun for the doctrines of the antitariff protests which had appeared for some years in South Carolina.

wishes, interests, and ambitions with those of the nation. Calhoun perceived the personal animus behind Jackson's hostile and uncalled-for "Union" toast, and commented quietly and more in sorrow than anger: "I must say, and with deep regret . . . that those to whom the vessel of state is entrusted seem either ignorant, or indifferent about the danger."²⁰ Leaving the public work of destroying Calhoun to Jackson, Van Buren remained concealed in the background, and offered at the Jefferson Birthday Dinner an innocuous toast, "Mutual forbearance and reciprocal concessions; thro' their agency the Union was established—the patriotic spirit from which they emanated will forever sustain it." It was characteristic of one whose "conciliatory" policy it was outwardly to feign innocent friendship towards those whose throats he was secretly endeavoring to cut. Many of Jackson's friends were astonished that he should prefer for the presidential succession a shift and selfish politician like Van Buren as against a statesman like Calhoun; and could only find some consolation in recalling that tyrants generally prefer toadies rather than independent men about them, that "birds of a feather flock together," and that the Emperor Caligula had made his horse a consul.

The Jefferson Birthday Dinner was not only not a Calhounian nullification affair, but its authors—the recent projectors of a West-South alliance—do not seem to have been motivated by a wish to draw out the President's sentiments on the political issues involved. No such design was imputed to them by any of the contemporary commentators on the dinner. Indeed, the proponents of the West-South alliance seem generally to have assumed the President's sympathy with their political program.²¹ Sufficient time had not yet elapsed since the opening of Jackson's administration by the beginning of April, 1830, to disclose his secret

²⁰ Calhoun to C. Van Deventer, May 12, 1830, in Jameson (ed.), *Correspondence of John C. Calhoun*, in *loc. cit.*, 273.

²¹ Van Buren, having instigated (through inspiring Jackson's toast of April 13) the opening of Jackson's war upon Calhoun, next sought to conciliate the South by inspiring Jackson's Maysville veto, checking internal improvements at Federal expense. Van Buren and Jackson had accomplished their object of beginning the isolation and discrediting of Calhoun, a policy well calculated to eliminate their personal rival and evade coming to terms with the South on the tariff. Those students who have considered Jackson no poli-

intention to do nothing to reduce the tariff. Even after the Birthday Dinner Webster wrote, in advising Clay: "Parties must now, necessarily, be sorted out, anew; and the great ground of difference will be *Tariff and Internal Improvements*. You are necessarily at the head of one party, and Gen J. will be, if he is not already, identified with the other."²²

After Jackson had insidiously imputed disunionism to Calhoun at the Birthday Dinner, the anti-Jackson press rejoiced to see the incipient breach in the Jacksonian ranks, and predicted that Benton, the chief author of the Jefferson love feast that had turned into a clash of arms, would follow Jackson in the war so suddenly announced by Jackson against Calhoun. The Philadelphia *National Gazette*, noting Benton's letter conveying Randolph's toast to the *Telegraph*, predicted: "The new nullifying party may apprehend that the Colonel will prove its *matador* in the strict Spanish sense. . . . Jackson seems to have taken the bull by the horns."²³ Benton did indeed, but at first reluctantly, fall in with Jackson—but with some doubts as to the ethics and expedience of Jackson's course; and he refused to vote for the "Bloody" Force Bill in 1833. Benton's explanation of his course is worth noting; and it doubtless typifies the reasoning which caused some of the other state rights Democrats to take sides with Jackson. The Missouri Senator wrote Nathaniel Beverley Tucker on February 11, 1833:

I could not concur in some of the doctrines of the [President's] Proclamation, but considering President Jackson as the *only* barrier against the B. U. S.—the *only* barrier against the new invaders of the public lands,—and the best hope for the reduction of the revenues to the wants of the government, I could not see the policy which should induce *me* to express opinions otherwise than in votes which the progress of the South Carolina Bills should make it my duty to give. . . . I cannot see any advantage in entering the field now for state rights. They are in the Caudine Forks, led there by the madness of S. C. nullification. The

tician have, it seems, been deceived by the subtle, deceptive and roundabout nature of Jackson's political maneuvers, which he frequently took elaborate pains to present to the public (and conceal) under false faces, as false as they were fair.

²² Webster to Clay, May 29, 1830, in Clay MSS.; published in Jameson (ed.), *Works of Webster*, XVI, 198-99.

²³ Quoted in the Washington *National Intelligencer*, April 24, 1830.

mass of the people think the Union is attacked, and that the Proclamation is to save it; and that brief view is decisive with them.²⁴

During Jackson's second administration Benton made great political capital as the President's right-hand man in the war on the Bank, and it was soon generally understood that Jackson's program for the presidential succession had been extended to include Benton as Van Buren's successor. After 1833, when Calhoun camped on the edge of the new Whig or anti-Jackson alliance, Benton became extremely hostile towards the Carolinian and frequently imputed disunionism to him; Benton's new attitude of hostility and suspicion was to a great extent, no doubt, inspired by the fact that he was now a rival of Calhoun for presidential honors. One has but to read Benton's late forgetful account of the Birthday Dinner of 1830²⁵—in which he made no mention whatever of his own prominent part in planning it, and in which the affair was somewhat misrepresented as a nullification conspiracy—to find evidence of the power that self-interest exerts in moulding men's words and actions.²⁶

²⁴ *William and Mary College Quarterly* (Williamsburg, Va., 1892-), XII (1904), 86-87; cf. Charles W. March, *Reminiscences of Congress* (New York, 1850), 196. At some time after Jackson's breach with Calhoun, Benton fell in with Jackson's plan of making Van Buren his successor. The President, indeed, eventually made acceptance of this plan a test of loyalty to himself within his party. But as late as January, 1832, Benton himself was in doubt as to Van Buren's position on the leading political issues of the day—so well had Van Buren long managed to keep his "principles" in an obscurity that was intentional! Benton's private letter of inquiry to Van Buren, January 28, 1832, is worth notice: "'For Vice-President,' on the Jackson ticket, will identify you with him; a few cardinal principles of the old democratic school might make you worth contending for on your own account. The dynasty of '98 (the federalists) has the Bank of the United States in its interest; and the Bank of the United States has drawn into its vortex, and wields at its pleasure, the whole high tariff and federal internal improvement party. To set up for yourself, and to raise an interest which can unite the scattered elements of a nation, you will have to take positions which are visible, and represent principles which are felt and understood; you will have to separate yourself from the enemy by partition lines which the people can see. The dynasty of '98 (federalists), the Bank of the United States, the high tariff party, the federal internal improvement party, are against you. Now, if you are not against them, the people, and myself, as one of the people, can see nothing between you and them worth contending for, in a national point of view. This is a very plain letter, and if you don't like it, you will throw it in the fire; . . . For myself, I mean to retire upon my [legal] profession, while I have mind and body to pursue it; but I wish to see the right principles prevail, and friends instead of foes in power." Benton, *Thirty Years' View*, I, 218-19.

²⁵ See above, n. 1.

²⁶ In his later years Calhoun spoke of Benton as the "biggest humbug" on earth: "He

The conduct of Van Buren and Jackson in the Jefferson Birthday Dinner similarly testifies to this feature of human nature. Too much credit should not be given to the *professed* grounds on which Jackson justified his warfare upon Calhoun, as professions are under suspicion; and it may be appropriately remembered that the aggressors in every political war in history waged, according to their own showing and statement, *bellum iustum piumque*, as the Romans expressed it—a just and pious war.

ought to have gone about all his life with quack doctors, and written puffs for their medicines. Had he done so, he might have made a fortune." Benjamin F. Perry, *Reminiscences of Public Men* (Philadelphia, 1883), 45.

Unionist Sentiment in South Carolina in 1860

By LILLIAN A. KIBLER

Though South Carolina took the lead in the secession movement of 1860, a study of contemporary correspondence, reminiscences, and newspapers reveals the fact that many of its leading citizens, especially in Charleston and the upper districts, staunchly opposed the secession of their state.¹ During the decade following the bitter failure of the secessionist attempt of 1850, a strong conservative reaction had taken place in South Carolina. Robert Barnwell Rhett and the radicals had been submerged, and a conservative party, formed from a union of the National Democrats, organized by James L. Orr of Anderson during the campaign of 1856, and the old co-operationists of 1850, had gained ascendancy in South Carolina politics.² This party held as its platform that the hope of the South lay in the Democratic party, which, if solidly supported, could maintain the dominance of the South in the Union. The co-operationists were convinced that the South would never unite in a secessionist move, and were gradually arriving at the conclusion that it would not be ruined by a continuation in the Union.

The leader of the conservatives in 1860 was James Henry Hammond, former governor of the state and an old co-operationist of 1850. Hammond had been elected to the United States Senate in 1857 over Rhett by a large majority, and in his contact with Southern politicians in Wash-

¹ The Charleston *Daily Courier*, the most conservative newspaper in South Carolina in 1860, and newspapers from the unionist upper districts—such as the *Keowee Courier*, *Lancaster Ledger*, and *Spartanburg Express*—have been used as the basis of this study.

² David D. Wallace, *The History of South Carolina*, 4 vols. (New York, 1934), III, 141-42.

ington had decided that "an overwhelming majority of the South" would prefer to remain in the Union if assured that it would be conducted on the "true principles of the Constitution."³ He had so stated in a speech to his constituents at Beach Island in 1858, and again at Barnwell courthouse, expressing his conviction that the South by continuance in the Union could "control its action in all great affairs."⁴ This Barnwell speech created quite a sensation in South Carolina—some of Hammond's constituents accused him of having turned "unionist"—but in general it was endorsed far and near.⁵

Thus the followers of Hammond, along with the "unionists per se," worked for maintenance of the Union in the stirring secessionist conflict of 1860. To the old patriotic group of unionists of 1832 and 1850 was added this new group of conservatives—a group which had decided that, for the present at least, Southern interests could best be preserved by a continuance in the Union. As Hammond so often stated, it was a unionism "of policy, not of principle"—a desire to maintain the Union in order to rule the Union.⁶

Rhett attempted to rally his forces in vain—the conservatives steadily gained strength in South Carolina from 1858 to 1860.⁷ The radical program for reopening of the African slave trade received a rebuke in the South Carolina Senate from Wade Hampton in a speech commended by the New York *Herald* as that of "a statesman, and a Union-loving statesman, on the main issue of the Union itself."⁸ The attempt of Rhett and William L. Yancey of Alabama to secure disruption of the Union by consolidating the South on the slave code for the territories likewise received no response in South Carolina.⁹

³ *Selections from the Letters and Speeches of Hon. James H. Hammond* (New York, 1866), 333-34.

⁴ *Ibid.*; Charleston *Courier*, July 27, 1858.

⁵ Paul F. Hammond, *Memoir of James Henry Hammond* (n.p., n.d., pamphlet, University of South Carolina Library), 12.

⁶ Correspondence of Hammond, April-December, 1860, Hammond Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

⁷ Laura A. White, *Robert Barnwell Rhett: Father of Secession* (New York, 1931), 150-56.

⁸ New York *Herald*, quoted in Spartanburg *Express*, January 18, 1860.

⁹ John W. Dubose, *The Life and Times of William Lowndes Yancey* (Birmingham, 1892), 439-40; White, *Robert Barnwell Rhett*, 154-55.

The secessionists in the legislature, however, caused a dangerous flare-up in December, 1859, over the John Brown affair at Harper's Ferry. They denounced the abolitionists in violent language, and attempted to secure South Carolina's leadership in a Southern movement for secession.¹⁰ But a brilliant young lawyer of Charleston, M. P. O'Connor, made a stirring appeal in the House of Representatives for maintenance of the Union. In impassioned and flowery language he depicted the glories of the past and the stupendous upheaval and revolution that would follow an attempt at dissolution of the Union.¹¹ The conservatives succeeded in limiting South Carolina's action to an expression of sympathy for Virginia and an invitation to the Southern states to a convention for consideration of measures of defense.¹² The unfavorable response of the states was another severe defeat for the radicals.¹³

Rhett, Yancey, and Edmund Ruffin of Virginia now staked their last hope for secession on the coming presidential election. As the date drew near for the Charleston national Democratic convention, the *Mercury* urged nonparticipation by South Carolina.¹⁴ Rhett considered nonparticipation by the Southern states the best means of splitting the Democratic party, thus insuring Republican victory and subsequent secession, not trusting Yancey's scheme for withdrawal of Southern delegates at Charleston upon failure to secure adoption of the slave code for the territories.¹⁵

But public opinion in South Carolina was overwhelmingly in favor of the conservatives, who favored participation and the nomination of a candidate acceptable to the North and South, thus insuring Democratic victory and a continuation of Southern dominance in the Union.¹⁶ The

¹⁰ Charleston *Courier*, December 3, 5, 10, 1859; South Carolina *House Journal*, 1859, pp. 71-73.

¹¹ Mary D. O'Connor, *The Life and Letters of M. P. O'Connor* (New York, 1893), 16-18.

¹² South Carolina *Senate Journal*, 1859, pp. 168-69; Keowee *Courier*, January 7, 1860.

¹³ Charleston *Mercury*, February 7, 1860.

¹⁴ Quoted in Orangeburg *Southron*, February 15, 1860; Sumter *Watchman*, March 7, 1860.

¹⁵ Famous Alabama Platform, adopted by Alabama convention on January 11, 1860. New York *Tribune*, March 15, 1860.

¹⁶ Keowee *Courier*, March 31, 1860; Lancaster *Ledger*, February 8, March 21, 1860; Charleston *Courier*, March 10, 1860.

state convention, held in Columbia on April 16, was a complete victory for the conservatives. Orr sounded the keynote of the assemblage in his presidential address, urging harmony for the best interests of the Democratic party and the preservation of the Union, and ending with the dramatic statement: "I am one of those who have believed, and who now believe, that this great Government, which was handed down to us by the noblest ancestors that any people ever had, is yet worth preserving; and if it can be preserved in unison with our rights, with our interests, and with our honor, so help me God, my hand shall never be raised to strike it down."¹⁷ The Alabama platform for withdrawal of Southern delegates at Charleston was repudiated by a large majority, and the sixteen delegates were sent uninstructed to the Charleston convention.¹⁸

Nevertheless, when the delegates arrived in Charleston, they succumbed to the pressure of the hour. Influenced by popular demonstrations in the streets and galleries, by Yancey's eloquent plea for the slave-code platform, followed by telegrams from South Carolina congressmen, thirteen of the South Carolina delegation joined the "sectional stampede" on the seventh day and withdrew from the convention.¹⁹ Their action was an intense shock to the conservatives of the state—and even to those of other Southern states, who, because of the stand taken by the state convention, had relied upon South Carolina to bring moderation to the national convention.²⁰

Two of the South Carolina delegation, however, refused to follow the stampede—Benjamin F. Perry and Colonel Lemuel Boozer. Perry was one of the most famous unionists of the state, a distinguished lawyer and editor of Greenville, whose *Southern Patriot* had been the only newspaper that held to the Union cause in the secession movement of 1850-1852.²¹ Boozer was a popular and successful lawyer of Lexington,

¹⁷ Charleston *Courier*, April 19, 1860; Keowee *Courier*, May 5, 1860.

¹⁸ Charleston *Courier*, May 12, 1860.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, April 28, May 8, 1860; B. F. Perry, "The National Democratic Convention in Charleston, 1860," in B. F. Perry, *Biographical Sketches of Eminent American Statesmen* (Philadelphia, 1887), 186-89.

²⁰ Washington correspondent, in Charleston *Courier*, April 24, 1860.

²¹ Perry, *Biographical Sketches*, 2-5, 150.

and also an ardent lover of the Union.²² Perry argued that rejection of the Alabama resolutions by the South Carolina convention constituted instructions to the delegates to remain in the Charleston convention. On the day following South Carolina's withdrawal, though greeted by a storm of hisses from the galleries, he addressed the convention, boldly proclaiming the madness of the course they were pursuing and appealing both to the Northern and to the Southern Democrats to give up their points of controversy for the sake of harmony in the Democratic party and the preservation of the Union. In defense of his action in remaining in the convention, he said: "I stand before you, Mr. President, an old-fashioned Union Democrat, born and bred such, and such I have continued, consistently, without faltering or wavering in my faith, amidst the storms of secession and nullification which have swept over South Carolina. . . . It was as a Democrat and a Union man that I came into this Convention, determined to do all that I could to preserve the Democratic party and the Union of the States."²³

During the weeks following the Charleston convention, intense excitement prevailed in South Carolina. The conservatives bemoaned the action of their delegates. Hammond called the Charleston secession a "fizzle"; Orr considered it "unwise and impolitic."²⁴ Chief Justice John Belton O'Neill of Newberry, a distinguished unionist since nullification days, wrote to the editors of the Newberry *Rising Sun*:

We are, I fear, in evil times; rashness is too much in the ascendant. I had hoped this Convention would act in harmony, and that a candidate would be selected who would unite the whole Democracy, Southern, Eastern, Western, as well as Northern. . . . How religious men can counsel violence and goad the people on to results which may bring about a servile war, or array section against section, is to me, strange—passing strange! . . . I have looked proudly to the stars and stripes, and said—'these are the emblems of my free and happy home!' Are these to be pulled down and trampled in the dust by mad and corrupt poli-

²² U. R. Brooks, *South Carolina Bench and Bar*, 3 vols. (Columbia, 1908), I, 175-76.

²³ Speech of Perry, in *Charleston Courier*, May 2, 1860; Perry, *Biographical Sketches*, 145-50, 187-88.

²⁴ Hammond to W. G. Simms, May 11, 1860, Hammond Papers; "Letter of James L. Orr," in *Spartanburg Express*, August 8, 1860.

ticians? God forbid! Freemen—descendants of the Patriots of '76—it is your duty to prevent such a disastrous result!²⁵

Perry's "valiant independence and courageous devotion to duty" in the convention were warmly commended by unionists of the state.²⁶ James L. Petigru congratulated him on the "noble stand" he had taken.²⁷ In the Charleston *Courier* of June 16, "Friends in Council" praised him as "the determined friend of the Union" and condemned the seceders for imperiling the peace and welfare of the whole country. Perry himself wrote several newspaper articles in vindication of his course.²⁸ In the Greenville *Patriot and Mountaineer*, he reiterated his view that the squabbling over platform was "foolish as well as suicidal," and that the South Carolina delegates had been influenced by the "outside pressure in Charleston."²⁹

But the radicals were triumphant in South Carolina during May and June. The excitement of Charleston was transferred to all districts of the state, where enthusiastic public meetings were held endorsing the action of their delegates at Charleston—even in Greenville, Perry's own district.³⁰ The state Democratic convention held in Columbia on May 30 to appoint delegates to the Richmond convention was completely controlled by the radicals. After the election of Rhett over I. W. Hayne, the conservative nominees withdrew their names, telling the convention to fill out the delegation with men who could harmonize with Rhett in his sentiments.³¹ They accused the radicals of misusing the power they had through the parish representative system, claiming that, in an appeal to the people, the conservatives would obtain two thirds of the vote of the state.³² The entire delegation was then elected from the Rhett fac-

²⁵ Quoted in Charleston *Courier*, May 11, 1860; Keowee *Courier*, June 9, 1860.

²⁶ Charleston *Courier*, June 16, 1860.

²⁷ Perry, *Biographical Sketches*, 603.

²⁸ "Letter of Col. B. F. Perry," in Columbia *South Carolinian*, quoted in Charleston *Courier*, May 19, 1860; Keowee *Courier*, June 2, 1860.

²⁹ Quoted in Charleston *Courier*, May 12, 1860.

³⁰ Charleston *Courier*, May 3, 12, 14, 17, 18, 21, 23, 1860; Camden *Weekly Journal*, May 15, 1860.

³¹ Charleston *Courier*, June 1, 1860; Spartanburg *Express*, June 6, 1860.

³² *Ibid.* The conservatives were justified in their claim, since the apportionment of representation in South Carolina in 1860, for legislature and conventions, was based both on the number of white inhabitants and the amount of taxes paid. Thus the radical parishes

tion, to the disgust of the conservatives, who deplored the sending of such "explosive material" to Richmond.⁸³ O'Neill wrote to Hammond: "I suppose Mr. Rhett will give us the war and disunion tunes at Richmond. What is to become of our country?"⁸⁴

The rather ludicrous rôle of the Rhett delegation at Richmond, adjourning from day to day to await the return of the other delegates from Baltimore, did not serve to strengthen Rhett's prestige in South Carolina.⁸⁵ After the endorsement of the Baltimore nominations by the Richmond convention, Rhett realized the unpopularity of his views, and upon his return to South Carolina ceased his "disunion tunes."⁸⁶ Bowing to the public sentiment of the state, he campaigned, along with the conservatives, for Breckinridge and "a Constitutional Union," urging the South to insist upon its rights "in the Union."⁸⁷ Hammond maintained that the entire South had been compelled to put itself on the platform of his Barnwell speech—to fight the battle *in* the Union.⁸⁸

As the summer wore on, however, and Lincoln's following reached an unexpected strength, voices in South Carolina arose for dissolution of the Union in event of Republican victory. Prominent among the agitators were Congressmen L. M. Keitt, William P. Miles, W. W. Boyce, and Governor William H. Gist, all of whom urged the prompt secession of South Carolina, "alone if necessary and at all hazards."⁸⁹

of the low country, where slavery and secessionism were predominant, because of their superior wealth, received larger representation than the conservative districts of the up-country, which had a larger proportion of white inhabitants. William A. Schaper, *Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina* (Washington, 1901), 434-37. This fact was of special significance in the legislature of November, 1860, in which the conservatives of the upper districts were powerless in their opposition to the call of the secession convention. At this time, likewise, it was claimed that a popular vote of the state would not support secession, evidence being given by a comparison of the daily circulation of the secessionist *Mercury*, 550, with that of the conservative *Courier*, 3,000. Charleston correspondent, in *New York Tribune*, November 10, 1860; editorial, *ibid.*, November 13, 1860.

⁸³ Editorial in *Keowee Courier*, June 9, 1860.

⁸⁴ John Belton O'Neill to Hammond, June 7, 1860, Hammond Papers.

⁸⁵ Charleston *Courier*, June 14, 1860; Hammond to Major M. C. M. Hammond, July 4, 1860, Hammond Papers.

⁸⁶ Charleston *Mercury*, July 2, 4, 1860.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, July 4, 1860; Charleston *Courier*, July 11, 1860.

⁸⁸ Hammond to Simms, July 10, 1860, Hammond Papers.

⁸⁹ Charleston *Courier*, August 8, 1860; Camden *Weekly Journal*, August 7, 28, 1860; William P. Miles to Hammond, August 5, 1860, Hammond Papers.

The conservatives, while also deeply concerned over the probability of Republican victory, tried to check the agitation of the radicals by urging South Carolina to wait for co-operation from other Southern states. Orr, in a letter to the *Anderson Gazette*,⁴⁰ and also in a speech at Williamston Springs,⁴¹ maintained that South Carolina should move only if Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi would co-operate—possibly, as Perry suggested, knowing that he was “perfectly safe in waiting for Georgia.”⁴² In a later letter, Orr expressed his “profound and abiding affection for the Union” and his trust that the impending storm might be averted and the Union saved.⁴³ The conservative *Courier* likewise chose diplomacy rather than open opposition as the best means of thwarting the radicals, proposing a convention of Southern states in event of Lincoln’s election.⁴⁴ In its editorial column a quotation from Breckinridge appeared without comment: “Instead of breaking up the Union, we intend to strengthen and to lengthen it.”⁴⁵

The state continued to rely on Hammond for leadership, who, however, avoided taking part in political meetings, attempting instead to mold public opinion into conservative channels by quietly advising his friends and constituents from his home at Redcliffe.⁴⁶ In a public letter he commended South Carolina for the “quiet course” she was pursuing in the presidential election, and urged support of Breckinridge and Lane as the only men who could “prolong and perhaps make permanent this confederacy.”⁴⁷

Perry boldly attacked the schemes of the secessionists in a strong article entitled “Disunion,” written to the *Charleston Courier* and copied widely by its exchanges, North and South. He accused the “disunion-

⁴⁰ Quoted in *Charleston Courier*, August 4, 1860; *Spartanburg Express*, August 8, 1860.

⁴¹ *Charleston Courier*, August 13, 1860; *Camden Weekly Journal*, August 14, 1860.

⁴² B. F. Perry, “Disunion,” in *Charleston Courier*, August 20, 1860.

⁴³ “Letter of Ex-Speaker Orr to Hon. Amos Kendall,” in *Spartanburg Express*, October 3, 1860; *Keowee Courier*, October 6, 1860.

⁴⁴ Editorial in *Charleston Courier*, August 20, 1860.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, August 31, 1860.

⁴⁶ *Edgefield Advertiser*, quoted in *Charleston Courier*, August 17, 1860.

⁴⁷ “Letter to J. T. Broyles, Esq’r.,” in *Anderson Intelligencer*, quoted in *Charleston Courier*, August 25, 1860; *Keowee Courier*, September 8, 1860; *Lancaster Ledger*, September 5, 1860; *New York Tribune*, August 29, 1860.

ists per se" of being the only ones who considered the election of a chief magistrate sufficient cause for the destruction of the Federal Union, affirming that others earnestly desired the perpetuity of the republic under which they had lived so happily.⁴⁸

As the time for the presidential election drew near, Yancey and Rhett marshaled their forces for action. Their plan was to arouse the spirit of resistance to fever heat, and then on the high tide of excitement to obtain their long-desired goal—separate state secession. Since the South Carolina legislature was to convene on November 5 to appoint presidential electors, they threw themselves into the campaign to secure the election of candidates pledged to separate secession.⁴⁹ But the conservatives exerted every effort to secure the election of moderates, and the press urged the people to send their best talent and most devoted patriots to the legislature.⁵⁰ The election returns showed a decided victory for the conservatives. In Charleston, for example, not more than four of the twenty men elected were in favor of separate state action.⁵¹

The conservatives over the state were afraid, however, that the excitement of the times would lead to some dangerous action on the part of the legislature. The *Keowee Courier* warned it of the gravity of calling a state convention.⁵² "Festina Lente" in the *Charleston Courier* advised the calling of a Southern congress to exhaust all efforts "to restore the purity of the present Union on a safe basis" before proceeding to destroy it.⁵³ Hammond announced that any movement in case of Lincoln's election would be "the weakest, most impolitic, and assuredly abortive movement" that South Carolina had made yet unless the South and West were behind it, and that he still stood on his Barnwell and Beach Island speeches, counseling "to fight the battle in the Union."⁵⁴

⁴⁸ "Disunion," in *Charleston Courier*, August 20, 1860, quoted in *Keowee Courier*, September 1, 1860; *Spartanburg Express*, August 29, 1860. For comments on the speech, see *Providence Journal* and *Cincinnati Gazette*, quoted in *Charleston Courier*, August 29, 31, 1860.

⁴⁹ *Charleston Mercury*, October 15, 1860; *Charleston Courier*, October 15, 18, 1860.

⁵⁰ *Charleston Courier*, September 17, October 4, 1860; *Lancaster Ledger*, August 15, 1860.

⁵¹ Charleston correspondent, in *New York Tribune*, October 17, 1860.

⁵² Editorial in *Keowee Courier*, October 20, 1860.

⁵³ *Charleston Courier*, November 3, 1860. The editor solicited careful perusal of the letter as emanating from "one of the clearest and most cultured minds in S. C."

⁵⁴ Hammond to Col. I. W. Hayne, September 19, 1860, Hammond Papers.

O'Neill feared some act of folly on the part of the legislature, but expressed his confidence that the "returning good sense of the people" and the protection of a kind God would avert secession, which he regarded as "revolution, exactly equal to that in '76."⁵⁵ Petigru also was still hopeful that secession might be averted, writing on October 28: "My own countrymen here in S. C. are distempered to a degree that makes them to a calm and impartial observer real objects of pity. . . . If Lincoln is elected it will give the Union a great strain; yet still I don't think that this state will secede alone."⁵⁶ Perry, in a speech to several hundred constituents at Anderson courthouse, earnestly pled for maintenance of the "great and glorious Union."⁵⁷

Unionist sentiment was still prevalent in the upper districts of the state, according to a preacher who worked along the border line of North Carolina and South Carolina. In November he wrote: "Let me say that in the Upper Districts of South Carolina at least, the majority are far from believing that we reap only misfortune and injury in the Union and that prosperity and blessing is to be had only in South Carolina setting up for herself."⁵⁸

When the legislature gathered in Columbia for the special session, the radicals openly proclaimed their program for the separate secession of South Carolina, urging the calling of a convention as early as possible.⁵⁹ But, according to the correspondent of the *Courier*, who had journeyed to Columbia with many legislators, the majority of the Charleston delegation and some from the upper districts were opposed to precipitate action and deemed it wisest to adjourn after taking the vote for presidential electors.⁶⁰ Another Charlestonian attending the session reported "some grave and substantial doubters, who would count the cost of rashly placing ourselves in hostile array against our powerful neigh-

⁵⁵ O'Neill to Hammond, September 22, 1860, *ibid.*

⁵⁶ James L. Petigru to Edward Everett, October 28, 1860, Petigru Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

⁵⁷ Anderson *Intelligencer*, quoted in Spartanburg *Express*, October 17, 1860; Charleston *Courier*, October 24, 1860.

⁵⁸ F. Asbury Mood to Hammond, November 2, 1860, Hammond Papers.

⁵⁹ Charleston *Mercury*, November 3, 1860.

⁶⁰ Charleston *Courier*, November 5, 1860.

bours," among them Samuel McAliley of Chester, A. W. Thomson of Union, and George Farrow and Gabriel Cannon of Spartanburg.⁶¹ Other evidence points to the conservatism of the legislature at the opening of the session. James Simons, a well-known conservative of Charleston, was re-elected Speaker, and sounded a note of moderation in his opening address.⁶² The legislative committee of the House of Representatives looked to Hammond for leadership, addressing a letter to him on November 6 requesting his counsel as to the course the state should pursue in event of Republican victory.⁶³

When the secessionists, upon news of Lincoln's victory, introduced in both houses resolutions calling for a convention, the conservatives tried to stem the tide by resolutions for delay. In the House, George A. Trenholm recommended that commissioners be sent to Georgia to secure its co-operation and that of the other Southern states before withdrawing from the Union.⁶⁴ Henry Buist introduced a bill for election of delegates on January 8, and assembling in convention on January 15, thinking the secessionist excitement would have subsided by that time.⁶⁵ In the Senate, H. D. Lesesne of Charleston opposed the resolution of R. B. Rhett, Jr., hastening the election to November 22, by a motion that the convention be assembled "so soon as any one of the other Southern states shall give satisfactory assurance or evidence of her determination to withdraw from the Union."⁶⁶

But the legislature was influenced by the pressure of outside circumstances. Secessionist orators in Columbia—Rhett, Congressmen Milledge L. Bonham and Keitt, and Edmund Ruffin—were responding to the serenades of an excited populace by spirited addresses urging the separate secession of South Carolina.⁶⁷ On November 7, when Republican victory

⁶¹ McCarter, *Journal kept at the South, 1860-66* (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress), I, 7-10. McCarter was evidently a Charleston merchant engaged in trade with the North and Europe.

⁶² *South Carolina House Journal*, 1860, p. 8; *Charleston Courier*, November 6, 1860.

⁶³ Legislative Committee to Hammond, November 6, 1860, Hammond Papers.

⁶⁴ *South Carolina House Journal*, 1860, pp. 18-19.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ *South Carolina Senate Journal*, 1860, pp. 14-15.

⁶⁷ *Camden Weekly Journal*, November 13, 1860; Ruffin Diary, 1859-1865 (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress), November 7, 1860.

was assured, A. G. Magrath dramatically resigned his office as United States district judge at Charleston, announcing that he considered it his duty to prepare to obey the wishes of his state.⁶⁸ News of his resignation caused the wildest excitement in Charleston and Columbia, and deeply affected the action of the legislature.⁶⁹ McCarter wrote, "From the moment this news was received all hesitation was at an end."⁷⁰

On November 9, the conservatives in the Senate again moved for delay. Senators Gabriel Cannon of Spartanburg, John C. Hope of Lexington, and McAliley of Chester expressed themselves in favor of deferring the convention as long as possible, in order to lay the issue more fully before the people. Their efforts were partially successful, the Buist convention bill being adopted, with delay of election of delegates until January 8.⁷¹

At this point, however, a second event occurred in Charleston that exerted strong pressure for secession on the legislature. On the evening of November 9, a public meeting at Institute Hall, after listening to stirring secessionist addresses and receiving assurance from Francis S. Bartow and James Jackson of Savannah that Georgia would come to the aid of South Carolina, adopted resolutions urging the general assembly to call a convention to meet at the "earliest possible moment and sever our connection with the present Government," and providing that a committee of three be sent by special train to Columbia to add pressure to the request.⁷² Telegrams having been received from the public meeting, the legislature manifested a different spirit on the following day. In the House, A. P. Aldrich recommended an amendment to the Buist convention bill, changing the election to December 6 and the date of

⁶⁸ Charleston *Courier*, November 8, 1860.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ McCarter Journal, I, 13.

⁷¹ South Carolina *Senate Journal*, 1860, p. 20; Charleston *Courier*, November 10, 1860; New York *Tribune*, November 14, 1860.

⁷² Charleston *Courier*, November 10, 1860. Many distinguished citizens of Georgia were in Charleston to celebrate completion of the Charleston-Savannah Railroad. After receiving news from Georgia of Robert Toombs's resignation and the Governor's recommendation for the immediate call of a convention, they joined in the Charleston celebration. *Ibid.*

convening to December 17.⁷³ The conservatives of the upper districts protested against such precipitate action, W. C. Black of York saying that the representatives of large districts needed time for a canvass to "bring the people up to the point," and Thomson of Union deploring such "hot haste" when opportunity was needed "to concentrate public opinion" in the rural districts. But Aldrich argued that the developments of the last twenty-four hours made "prompt, decided action" necessary, and that Georgia would come to the aid of South Carolina.⁷⁴ Finally, the convention bill with the Aldrich amendment was passed unanimously by the House.⁷⁵ The Senate, likewise influenced by the resolutions from Charleston, accepted the amendment unanimously with its hastening of the election to December 6—but McAliley, Wade Hampton, James W. Harrison, and Elam Sharpe were absent when the vote was taken.⁷⁶

Hammond was stunned by the action of the legislature. He had written a letter to the legislative committee on November 8, in answer to their request for his views, stating that the election of Lincoln was not sufficient cause for secession and urging South Carolina not to take the lead in a secession move.⁷⁷ But his letter had been suppressed, Aldrich returning the paper with a note attempting to justify the precipitate action of the legislature, but with the following clear admission that public opinion did not support that action: "I do not believe the common people understand it, in fact I know that they do not understand it; but whoever waited for the common people when a great move was to be made—We must make the move and force them to follow."⁷⁸ Upon receipt of a letter from his colleague in the United States Senate, James Chesnut, announcing his resignation, and a request from W. D. Porter, president of the South Carolina Senate, for him to follow suit, Hammond formally resigned on November 12. But in a letter to his brother the same day, he showed his utter disgust with the secession move:

⁷³ South Carolina *House Journal*, 1860, p. 33.

⁷⁴ Foregoing speeches in Charleston *Courier*, November 12, 1860; New York *Tribune*, November 12, 1860; Lancaster *Ledger*, November 21, 1860.

⁷⁵ South Carolina *House Journal*, 1860, p. 35.

⁷⁶ South Carolina *Senate Journal*, 1860, p. 22; New York *Tribune*, November 15, 1860.

⁷⁷ Hammond to Legislative Committee, November 8, 1860, Hammond Papers.

⁷⁸ Aldrich to Hammond, November 25, 1860, *ibid.*

"C'est fini. I have resigned. I heard yesterday that Chesnut and Toombs had resigned—Why I know not. . . . People are wild. The scenes of the French Revolution are being enacted already. . . . God knows the end."⁷⁹ Though he received many invitations to speak at public meetings throughout the state and even in Georgia, Hammond wrote to all letters of regret, for his heart was not in the movement.⁸⁰

But the revolution was gathering force throughout the state. After the convention call even the conservatives seemed to think that South Carolina was committed to secession, and that loyalty to the state required their endorsement. The secessionist leaders concentrated their efforts on winning over the upper districts—those in which the people had "to be brought up to the point," as Black had said in the legislature. To this task the conservatives lent their aid, since these districts would put no trust in the utterances of radicals. In the fortnight following the call for a convention, excited gatherings were held in Anderson, Chester, Winnsboro, Abbeville, Pendleton, Spartanburg, and Greenville, which were addressed by such well-known conservatives as C. G. Memminger, Magrath, Chesnut, and Orr, urging support for the secession cause. All the districts enthusiastically endorsed the action of the legislature—even Greenville, the old unionist stronghold of 1851.⁸¹

Excitement was kept at fever heat by the secessionists for a period of several weeks, but by the time for the election of delegates to the convention on December 6 it was waning. In Charleston, there was a decided conservative reaction. Prominent citizens voiced opposition to the contemplated secession of their state—among them Henry Gourdin, a wealthy cotton merchant, George S. Bryan, a famous lawyer who had been an ardent Union man since 1832, and Petigru.⁸² Likewise, two other distinguished Charlestonians, though now too old to take active part in politics, lent their influence to the unionist cause—Judge Mitch-

⁷⁹ Hammond to M. C. M. Hammond, November 12, 1860, *ibid.*

⁸⁰ *Id.* to Mitchell, *id.* to Simpson, November 22, 1860, *ibid.*

⁸¹ Charleston *Courier*, November 16, 19, 26, 1860; New York *Tribune*, November 30, 1860; Keowee *Courier*, December 1, 1860; Spartanburg *Express*, November 28, 1860.

⁸² McCarter Journal, I, 22.

ell King, who had been prominent in the educational and political circles of Charleston for many years, and had represented the Union party in the conventions of 1832 and 1852,⁸³ and Judge Edward Frost, a friend of Perry for many years during their service together in the state legislature.⁸⁴

In the first nominations appearing in the Charleston newspapers, Rhett and the radicals seemed in the ascendancy; but as December approached, a sentiment for caution and reconsideration was manifest.⁸⁵ Names of well-known unionists appeared in the nominations: Alfred Huger, the venerable postmaster of Charleston, who had made an eloquent speech against secession at the Charleston public meeting in November;⁸⁶ William Grayson, whose nomination was hailed as the first "Ripple on the Secession Sea" in South Carolina by the New York *Tribune*, recalling that it was "Mr. Grayson who, 'solitary and alone,' set the Union ball in motion in 1850";⁸⁷ and M. P. O'Connor, who had won fame in the legislature for his unionist speech on the Harper's Ferry affair. Likewise, prominent conservatives were nominated, such as Hayne, Memminger, and Magrath.⁸⁸

The election returns in Charleston were a distinct disappointment to Rhett and the radicals—Magrath led the ticket, and Rhett was seventh on the list.⁸⁹ Nine of the twenty-two candidates elected were old co-operationists, and the radicals feared that Memminger, especially, might speak in the convention "with an eye to delay for cooperation."⁹⁰ The Charleston correspondent of the New York *Tribune* considered the con-

⁸³ John Belton O'Neill, *Biographical Sketches of the Bench and Bar of South Carolina*, 2 vols. (Charleston, 1859), I, 347-67.

⁸⁴ B. F. Perry, "Edward Frost," in Brooks, *South Carolina Bench and Bar*, I, 175-76.

⁸⁵ Charleston *Courier*, November 30, December 3, 4, 1860; Charleston *Mercury*, December 4, 5, 1860.

⁸⁶ McCarter Journal, I, 20; Charleston *Courier*, November 30, 1860.

⁸⁷ New York *Tribune*, December 10, 1860. Grayson had launched the movement against secession in 1850 by issuing unionist pamphlets and openly expressing his views in the newspapers. He had lost his position as collector of customs thereby, and turned to poetry defending slavery as a consolation. Robert D. Bass (ed.), *William J. Grayson: Autobiography* (Columbia, 1933), Introduction, 27-55.

⁸⁸ Charleston *Courier*, December 4, 1860.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, December 8, 1860.

⁹⁰ Charleston correspondent, in New York *Evening Post*, December 11, 13, 1860.

servative rally the result of "dawning sober second thought," and even expressed the opinion that if the election had been a week later, "a positive Union party" would have developed itself in South Carolina.⁹¹

In Greenville, three strong unionist candidates were nominated for the convention: Perry, O'Neill,⁹² and James Petigru Boyce, president of the Baptist Theological Seminary. But the thoroughgoing campaign of the secessionists had not been held in vain—the Union ticket was overwhelmingly defeated,⁹³ Perry being beaten in his own county for the first time in twenty years.⁹⁴ As in Charleston, however, the conservatives, such as Orr, rather than the radicals, were elected.⁹⁵ In Spartanburg, though the unionists were defeated,⁹⁶ conservatism was also raising its head. A few days before the election a public meeting was held at which the following resolution was adopted: "Resolved, That according to our opinion S. C. is now acting rather hastily; that the Convention was called prematurely; that the meeting of the Convention should not have taken place until the middle of January or the first of February, so that the course the other Southern States will pursue might be known."⁹⁷

Unionists in other upper districts of the state tried to stem the secession tide during the campaign. In Union, the antisecessionists were led by Thomas N. Dawkins, a distinguished lawyer and judge who had served for many years in the state legislature.⁹⁸ In Abbeville, Judge David L. Wardlaw, noted for his brilliance in oratory since college days, "boldly and unflinchingly" spoke for the Union in spite of angry demonstrations by the secessionists to silence him.⁹⁹ In Newberry, Chancellor Job Johnstone, a lawyer of pre-eminent ability, recently appointed associate justice on the Court of Appeals, and Chief Justice O'Neill did all

⁹¹ New York *Tribune*, December 11, 1860.

⁹² O'Neill had a summer residence in Greenville.

⁹³ Charleston *Courier*, December 10, 1860.

⁹⁴ A. B. Williams, "An Outline of Governor Perry's Life," in Perry, *Biographical Sketches*, 6.

⁹⁵ Charleston *Courier*, December 10, 1860.

⁹⁶ Spartanburg *Express*, December 12, 1860.

⁹⁷ Charleston correspondent, in New York *Tribune*, December 11, 1860.

⁹⁸ Brooks, *South Carolina Bench and Bar*, I, 125-26.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 134-35.

in their power to convince their fellow citizens of the folly of secession,¹⁰⁰ but when addressing a public gathering from the courthouse steps, had eggs and turnips hurled at their heads by the radicals.¹⁰¹ Nevertheless, their eloquent oratory must have had its effect, for although the secessionists in Newberry won, "the majority of those entitled to suffrage" did not vote.¹⁰²

The unionists were defeated throughout the state, but as a whole the convention was to be composed of the "best manhood of the Palmetto State"—distinguished ex-governors, members of the bench, educators, congressmen, ministers, and business men.¹⁰³ The people had selected men of moderation and thoughtfulness on whose judgment they could rely.

The secessionists were alarmed by the conservative rally during the week or so preceding the election. It was fear of just such a reaction that had prompted them to convene the convention on December 16—as Petigru remarked, they were afraid "to trust the second thought of even their own people."¹⁰⁴ Now, a decided reaction was apparent in Columbia. By the last of November one of its citizens claimed: "If a true vote on the question could be taken, the majority of the people of S. C. would refuse to go out of the Union."¹⁰⁵ In the legislature, which had reconvened for its regular session on November 26, there developed a party for delay¹⁰⁶—"a powerful undercurrent" opposed to precipitate action.¹⁰⁷ Petigru, attending the legislative session to report on codification of the

¹⁰⁰ John Belton O'Neill and John Chapman, *Annals of Newberry* (Charleston, 1892), 380-81.

¹⁰¹ Recounted to writer by Johnstone's grandson, Alan Johnstone of Newberry.

¹⁰² O'Neill and Chapman, *Annals of Newberry*, 373. Probably the light vote in Newberry and other districts was due to the fact that many unionists and conservatives refrained from electing delegates to a convention which they considered pledged to secession.

¹⁰³ Yates Snowden and H. G. Cutler (ed.), *History of South Carolina*, 5 vols. (Chicago, 1920), II, 666-67.

¹⁰⁴ Petigru to Mrs. Jane Petigru North, November 13, 1860, in J. P. Carson, *Life, Letters, and Speeches of James Louis Petigru, the Union Man of South Carolina* (Washington, 1920), 361.

¹⁰⁵ "Extract from a Private Letter," in *New York Tribune*, November 27, 1860.

¹⁰⁶ Aldrich to Hammond, December 6, 1860, Hammond Papers.

¹⁰⁷ Columbia correspondent, in *Baltimore American*, quoted in *New York Tribune*, December 7, 1860.

laws,¹⁰⁸ predicted the development of "bitter animosities and divisions" among the members, but feared the reaction would come too late.¹⁰⁹

The radical leaders exerted every effort to keep excitement at fever heat until the assembling of the convention. Governor Gist addressed stirring messages to the legislature on November 26 and December 7, urging the necessity of immediate secession in order that South Carolina might not exert "a blighting and chilling influence upon the action of the other Southern States."¹¹⁰ Charleston secessionists, distrustful of the atmosphere of Columbia, began agitating as early as November 27 for holding the convention in Charleston instead of Columbia, on the ground that it would be difficult to "find suitable accommodations" in Columbia for both the legislature and the convention.¹¹¹ On the same day the directors of the South Carolina Institute offered Governor Gist the service of their hall "for the Legislature or the Convention."¹¹²

The secessionists in the legislature, of course, were anxious to avail themselves of the Charleston invitation, and an unusual coincidence played into their hands. A smallpox scare had broken out in Columbia during the last days of November, which, though reported unalarming by the Board of Health, caused a proposal in the House on November 29 to adjourn to Charleston "in case the sickness assumed a serious type."¹¹³ When an increase in the number of cases was reported on December 12, a heated debate took place in the legislature, and the report of seven new cases on December 14 increased the excitement.¹¹⁴ Though Wade Hampton announced that he had consulted six physicians, who had stated there was no danger to the legislature, the secessionists carried their motion to adjourn to Charleston.¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁸ He had been honored by the legislature the previous year with appointment to this responsible task. *South Carolina Senate Journal*, 1859, p. 141.

¹⁰⁹ Petigru to Mrs. Jane Petigru North, December 6, 1860, in Carson, *James Louis Petigru*, 362.

¹¹⁰ *South Carolina House Journal*, 1860, pp. 26-29, 136-37; *New York Tribune*, December 11, 1860.

¹¹¹ *Charleston Courier*, November 27, 1860.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, November 28, 1860.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, November 29, 1860; *South Carolina House Journal*, 1860, p. 7.

¹¹⁴ *Charleston Courier*, December 13-15, 1860.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, December 15, 1860; *South Carolina House Journal*, 1860, p. 214; *South Carolina Senate Journal*, 1860, p. 119.

Under these exciting circumstances, the convention delegates arrived in Columbia and opened their session in the Baptist Church on the morning of December 17. The report of the Board of Health the preceding day announcing fourteen new cases of smallpox made it almost certain the convention would adjourn to Charleston.¹¹⁶ The speech of the president, D. F. Jamison, urging in stirring language the immediate secession of the state, added to the tense excitement. After a brief, but heated debate, the resolution for adjournment to Charleston on the following day was adopted.¹¹⁷ At the evening session, after listening to the ardent addresses of Commissioners John A. Elmore of Alabama and Charles E. Hooker of Mississippi urging the immediate secession of South Carolina and promising hearty support from their states, the convention adopted unanimously a resolution favoring secession and the appointment of a committee to draft the ordinance.¹¹⁸

The convention had committed itself to secession with breath-taking haste. The Charleston correspondent of the New York *Tribune* attributed this fact to the policy of Jamison in framing the committees to "facilitate precipitation," maintaining that with another presiding officer there would have been a "delay of days or possibly weeks."¹¹⁹ The Columbia press resented greatly the smallpox agitation by the legislature and the Charleston press, and deplored the "cowardly stampede" made to Charleston.¹²⁰ But there was wild rejoicing among the secessionists of Charleston, who had feared a movement in Columbia to have the Ordinance of Secession submitted to the people, and now hoped to exercise "a potent influence" upon the deliberations of both the legislature and the convention.¹²¹

When the delegates arrived in Charleston on December 18, they were

¹¹⁶ Charleston *Courier*, December 17, 19, 1860.

¹¹⁷ South Carolina *Convention Journal*, 1860-1862, pp. 3-4, 10; Charleston *Courier*, December 18, 1860.

¹¹⁸ John A. Elmore to Governor A. B. Moore, in *War of Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (Washington, 1880-1901), Ser. IV, Vol. I, 20; South Carolina *Convention Journal*, 1860-1862, pp. 11, 12.

¹¹⁹ New York *Tribune*, December 25, 1860.

¹²⁰ Columbia correspondent, *ibid.*

¹²¹ Charleston correspondent, in New York *Tribune*, December 18, 1860.

greeted at the station with an ovation—a salute of fifteen guns, military companies, and cheering throngs of secessionists. Though the *Courier* urged the populace to abstain from demonstrations influencing the acts or speeches of the members, the sessions of the convention were interrupted by noisy crowds in the galleries.¹²² Each hour added to the tense excitement. On December 19, Ruffin arrived to lend his moral support to the secessionist cause;¹²³ a telegram from Governor A. B. Moore of Alabama urged “no compromise or delay”;¹²⁴ jostling crowds increased in the lobbies outside St. Andrew’s Hall.¹²⁵ When John A. Inglis reported the Ordinance of Secession the following day, it was adopted without a dissenting voice.¹²⁶ But a witness of the proceedings wrote that its adoption was like “a threat fulfilled rather than a duty performed,” and that the delegates seemed “startled rather than pleased at what they had done.”¹²⁷ In the debate following its passage, one of the delegates, Andrew P. Calhoun, voiced a feeling of foreboding when he said: “We have pulled a temple down that has been built three-quarters of a century. We must clear the rubbish away to reconstruct another. We are now houseless and homeless, and we must secure ourselves against storms.”¹²⁸

On the day following the signing of the fatal document, Petigru, when asked by a friend to define his position, answered, “I have seen the last happy day of my life.”¹²⁹ But the unionists, with one accord, bowed to the decision of their state. Perry expressed the sentiments of all when he said that he had been trying for the last thirty years to save the state from the horrors of disunion, that it was now “going to the devil,” but he would go with it, since honor and patriotism required every citizen to defend his country, or leave it.¹³⁰

¹²² Charleston *Courier*, December 19, 1860.

¹²³ Ruffin Diary, December 19, 1860.

¹²⁴ South Carolina *Convention Journal*, 1860-1862, p. 27.

¹²⁵ Charleston *Courier*, December 20, 1860.

¹²⁶ South Carolina *Convention Journal*, 1860-1862, pp. 42-43.

¹²⁷ Charleston correspondent, in New York *Tribune*, December 24, 1860.

¹²⁸ Proceedings of convention December 20, in New York *Tribune*, December 24, 1860.

¹²⁹ *Memorial of the Late James L. Petigru, Proceedings of the Bar of Charleston, S. C., March 25, 1863* (New York, 1866), 3-4.

¹³⁰ B. F. Perry, *Reminiscences of Public Men* (Philadelphia, 1883), 259-60.

During the disastrous years of war and reconstruction that followed, John D. Ashmore perhaps voiced the feeling of many other Carolinians when he wrote of Perry: "Oh! that his counsel and wisdom had been followed and carried out as the guiding star of our cause, that a nation might rise up and call him 'blessed'; for full well would he have merited the blessing and been entitled to the proud distinction 'of the savior of his country.'"¹⁸¹

¹⁸¹ "Eulogy by Hon. John D. Ashmore," in Perry, *Biographical Sketches*, 606-607.

Notes and Documents

KING'S MOUNTAIN: LETTERS OF COLONEL ISAAC SHELBY

Edited by J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON

The following documents were given to the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina several years ago. The donor has no information as to how they came into the possession of her family.

Colonel William Hill, to whom the letters were addressed, was born in Ireland in 1741. Emigrating to America, he settled first in York County, Pennsylvania, and later in what is now York County, South Carolina. With Isaac Hayne, he established on Allison's Creek the Æra Furnace, which was operated successfully for many years and furnished Charleston with all the cannon balls used during the siege of 1780. Burned out by the British, he joined General Thomas Sumter as a lieutenant colonel of militia and distinguished himself at Rocky Mount. He was wounded at Hanging Rock, but, in spite of it, fought at King's Mountain.

After the close of the war he restored his iron works, served many times in the state legislature, and was prominent in public affairs. Deeply interested in the military events in which he had taken part, he waited for years hoping that an accurate account of them might be written, but, despairing of this, he began to gather material from other participants, and in this way procured from Isaac Shelby the following narrative, which constituted an important source for the *Memoirs of the Revolu-*

tion which he dictated in 1815, the year before his death.¹ It is interesting that, after the lapse of so many years, the narrative should at last see the light.²

Frankfort,
The seat of Government
of Kentucky, March 4th, 1814

Dear Sir

I have to acknowledge receipt of your favor of the 7th of January last, which came to hand only four days ago. And now haste to answer it, by the first Southern Mail.

You inform me that you are about to write the history of the Battle of Kings Mountain, and several others, that were fought in So. Carolina, and you request such information as I can give you."

My antient private papers are all at my farm fifty miles from this place and owing to my official duties here I may not have it in my power to go to my farm under two or three months— But I can inform you that I have documents, and data, in my possession, which will afford a more detailed account of the action on Kings Mountain, and the causes that led to that event, than can be given by any other man alive.

I will communicate them to you, as soon as I can spend a few days at home and also of the action fought at the Cedar Spring, near Warfords Iron Works, in July 1780, of the taking of the British fort, on Thicketty, in the same month, and of the action at Musgroves Mill on the Enoree river, in August of the same year, & of the reduction of a British post at Colliton Hall, near Monks Corner in Nov. 1781, at all of which I was an eye witness.

You are very correct when you say that "Historians & those who have wrote of the Revolution, either through want of information or design have given a very erroneous account of those events etc." of the action on Kings Mountain. I have seen no history any thing like the truth.

The case which you state of "Col. Williams³ having robbed Major Mc-

¹ This memoir, to which Draper had access and which he freely used in his *King's Mountain and Its Heroes*, was published for the first time, from a copy in the Library of Congress, by Mr. A. S. Salley, Jr., of the South Carolina Historical Commission, in 1921. In speaking of the action at Musgrove's Mill, Colonel Mills says (p. 24): "I do not give the information of my own knowledge but give it from an officer of high standing who was present at the action." Draper adds (p. 122 n.): "the date and details going to show that Colonel Shelby was his authority."

² I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Miss Anne King Gregorie's sketch of Colonel Mills in the *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. (New York, 1928-1936), IX, 48-49, for the facts of Colonel Mills' life.

³ Colonel James Williams (1740-1780), a native of Virginia, who, after a brief stay in North Carolina, settled in what is now Laurens County, South Carolina. He served in the Provisional Congress of 1775, took part in one of the expeditions against the Cherokees, was

Dowell⁴ of the credit of reducing a post of the Enemy" must I presume allude to the battle fought at Musgroves Mill on the Enoree river, on the 19th of August, 1780, for I recollect of none other from whence prisoners were taken to Hillsborough— I commanded the right wing in that action, and Col. Elija Clarke⁵ of Georgia the left— there were many field officers in the action who had volunteered their services from McDowell's camp, at Smith's ford of Broad River of which Col. Williams was one who had a few men who always adhered to him. His object was, if the enterprise succeeded, to reach his own home somewhere near Ninety Six but in which he was disappointed by the rapid and Mariculous retreat we were forced to make from the field of battle on account of an express from Col. McDowell⁶ informing us of the defeat of the Grand Army, under General Gates near Camden. Our retreat was up towards the mountains and along them into No. Carolina from whence I crossed over to the western waters where I lived; left the prisoners we had taken in the action with Col. Clarke who I understood consigned them to the care of Col. Williams to take to Hillsborough in No. C.

I understood afterwards he did, and arrogated to himself the sole honour of Commanding the action in which they had been captured.

be so good as to acknowledge the receipt of this letter and let me know what direction to give a letter, to reach you more certainly. One directed to me at this place will come safe to hand & I shall expect a line from you before I write you again.

Very respectfully,
Your most Ob. servant,
Isaac Shelby,

William Hill, Esqr.

Frankfort, Kentucky,
August 26, 1814

Dear Sir

Your favour of the 22nd of April has been some time at hand, but owing to for a time under General Sumter, but left him without notice. He was a dashing soldier, but had the reputation among many of his contemporaries of being utterly unscrupulous.

⁴ Joseph McDowell (1756-1801) of "Quaker Meadows," Burke County, North Carolina, was a native of Virginia who had seen service against the Cherokees and fought at Ramseur's Mill and Musgrove's Mill. After the war he served in both houses of the North Carolina legislature, in the conventions of 1788 and 1789, and in Congress.

⁵ Elijah Clarke (1733-1799), a native of North Carolina, went to Wilkes County, Georgia, in 1774 and, on the outbreak of the Revolution, became a famous partisan leader. After the close of the war he fought Indians, accepted a French commission as major general from Genêt, and was later the founder of the so-called "Trans-Oconee State."

⁶ Charles McDowell (c. 1743-1815) of "Quaker Meadows," Burke County, North Carolina, was a native of Virginia. He saw service as captain and lieutenant colonel of militia, and took part in the Cherokee expedition of 1776.

a tedious indisposition, and the official duties of my public station, I have been unable to attend earlier to its contents.

I now enclose you such a sketch of events of the Revolutionary War to the Southward that came within my own observation, as well as my recollection serves— In the right and left wings of the army that defeated Major Ferguson— there were several other field officers of distinction whose names I dont recollect and cannot state their true position in those lines—you can remedy any defect.

There will be no occasion in your history of using my name as the author of any information of events.

Be so good as to acknowledge receipt of this letter with its inclosure, a line directed to me at this place will come safe to hand by mail— and when your history is printed I shall be glad to have a copy. I have the honor to be

Your friend,

Isaac Shelby

William Hill Esqr.

Shortly after the fall of Charlestown in May, 1780. The enemy had well over run the States of Georgia & So. Carolina and had advanced to the borders of No. Carolina— General Charles McDowell of the latter State made a requisition of Colonel Isaac Shelby & Colonel John Sevier to march a body of militia from the Western Waters to aid in repeling the enemy who were in considerable force under Major Ferguson— It was in the month of July of the same year Col. Shelby & Col. Sevier marched with the regiments of Sullivan & Washington Counties and formed a junction with General McDowell, on Broad river with which force he was able to check the advance of the Enemy Commanded by Ferguson, an officer of great experience and enterprise as a partyzan, who headed a force of British and Tories amounting to upwards of three thousand men.

Very shortly after this acquisition of force General McDowell Detached Col. Shelby & Lieut. Col. Elija Clarke with six hundred men to attack and carry a British post on Thicketty garrisoned principally by tories & commanded by Capt. Patrick Moore⁷— The American detachment consisted of six hundred men who appeared before the british garrison & instantly surrounded it on the morning of the 22nd July, 1780, just at day light— Capt. William Cocke,⁸ was sent in with a flag by Col. Shelby to demand a surrender of the Garrison. Capt. Moore at first refused to surrender, but on being warned by Capt. Cocke of the conse-

⁷ Patrick Moore, a native of Virginia of Irish descent, settled in South Carolina. In the Revolution he was a Loyalist and a dashing partisan leader. He died in 1781.

⁸ William Cocke (1784-1828), a native of Virginia, settled in the Holston Valley in 1774. He went with Daniel Boone to Kentucky and took part in the founding of Transylvania. He saw service in the Revolution, served in the legislatures of Virginia and North Carolina, and was active in the movement to establish the state of Franklin. Cocke held many offices in Tennessee and was United States Senator for nine years. He went to Mississippi as Indian agent and spent his last years there.

quences of the garrison being stormed by the Americans he surrendered although his post was made doubly strong by abbeetes well constructed around it. Our men took one hundred prisoners of the enemy & two hundred stand of arms that were all charged with bullets & buck shot. This surrender was a fortunate event as the place was capable of sustaining an attack from double our force of small arms.

At this time Major Ferguson, with an army of three Thousand Tories & British with a small squaddron of horse commanded by Major Dunlap⁹ lay encamped some miles south of Warfords Iron Works in the edge of South Carolina. General McDowell detached Colonel Shelby with Lieut. Col. Clarke & Col. Joseph McDowell with seven or eight hundred horse men to reconnoitre the Enemys Camp and cut off any of his foraging parties which might fall in their way— Col. Shelby with this light party, hung upon the Enemy's lines for several days— until the morning of the 22nd of July just at day light at the Cedar Springs he fell in with a reconnoitering party from the enemys camp of about the strength of his own party, and near Warfords Iron Works, Commanded by Major Dunlap— an action severe and bloody ensued for near an hour, when the enemys main body came up, and the Americans were obliged to give way, with the loss of near twenty men and some valuable officers. Colonel Clarke was taken prisoner. It was believed our men killed more than double that number of the Enemy as they brought off upwards of fifty prisoners mostly british regulars with one lieutenant and one ensign— General McDowell lay at that time 25 miles or upwards distant on the north side of broad river at the Cherokee ford with the main army. The enemy made great efforts to regain the prisoners and continued their pursuit for several miles— often occasioned our party to form and give battle while the prisoners were hurried on ahead, by which means the Americans made good their retreat to Genl. McDowells head quarters with all the prisoners on one of the warmest days ever felt.

General McDowell continued to manuvre on the north side of broad river, not being in force to attempt an attack upon Ferguson camp, until the 18th of August at which time he received information that five hundred tories were incamped at Musgroves Mill on the Bank of the Enoree river— Colonel Shelby & Lieut Col. Clarke were again selected by General McDowell to head the detachment destined to cut up that party of tories. McDowells camp was then at Smiths ford of broad river forty miles or upwards from the tories incamped at Musgroves— Major Ferguson lay about half way with all his force and only two or three miles from the rout our party had to travel. They Commenced their March from Smiths ford at sun about one hour high on the evening of the 18th of August, 1780, with seven hundred picked men well mounted, amongst whom were several of the field officers of McDowells Army who voluntiered their

⁹ James Dunlap, commissioned captain in the Queen's Rangers in 1776, came to South Carolina in 1779 and quickly won a deserved reputation for heartless brutality. He was killed in 1781.

services and they were joined by Col. Jno¹⁰ Williams and his followers making all together a force of between seven and eight hundred picked men— They traveled through the woods until dark, then took the road, and travelled fast all the night great part of the way in a canter, never stopped even to let their horses drink, & arrived within half a mile of the enemy camp just at break of day, where they were met by a strong patrol party of the enemy, coming out to reconnoitre— a sharp fire commenced in which several of the enemy fell & they gave back to their camp; at this juncture a country man who lived in sight came up & informed Colonel Shelby that the enemy had been strongly reinforced the evening before with six hundred regular troops, from Ninety Six, the queens American regiment from New York commanded by Col. Innes¹¹— The Americans after a hard travel all night of forty miles or upwards were too much broke down to retreat, they prepared for a battle as fast as possible, by making a breast works of logs and brush which they completed in half an hour, when the Enemys whole force appeared in full view, their lines lay across the road upwards of half a mile in length, a small party under Capt. Shadrack Inman,¹² had been sent on to scrimmage with the Enemy as soon as they crossed the river (for their Camp was on the south side at Musgroves plantation)— Capt. Inman had orders to give way as the enemy advanced— when they came within 70 yards of our breast works a heavy & destructive fire commenced upon them— The action was bloody & obstinate for upwards of an hour and a half— The Enemy had gotten within a few yards of our works, at that juncture Colonel Innes who commanded the enemy was badly wounded and carried back, and every other regular officer except one Lieutenant of the british was either killed or wounded when the enemy began to give way, just at that moment also Captain Hawsey¹³ an officer of considerable distinction among the tories was shot down near our lines while making the greatest efforts to animate his men. The Tories upon the fall of Capt. Hawsey broke in great confusion, the slaughter from thence to the Enoree river about half a mile was very great dead men lay thick on the Ground over which our men pursued the enemy— In this pursuit Capt. Inman was killed while pressing the enemy close in his rear— great merit was due to Capt. Inman for the manner in which he brought on the action— and to which the success of the day was greatly to be attributed— This action was one of the hardest ever fought in the United States with small arms. The smoke was so thick as to hide a man at the distance of twenty yards— Our men took two hundred prisoners during the action, and would have improved the victory to great advantage, their

¹⁰ Shelby throughout his narrative calls Colonel Williams "John," possibly confusing him with his brother, Judge John Williams of North Carolina.

¹¹ Lieutenant Colonel Alexander Innes was a Scotchman who came to South Carolina as secretary to Governor Lord William Campbell. In 1780 he became colonel of the South Carolina Royalists and in 1782 was made inspector general of the Loyalist forces.

¹² Shadrack Inman of South Carolina won a reputation as an able and fearless officer.

¹³ William Howsey was a noted Tory leader.

object was to be in Ninety Six that night distant 25 or 30 miles and weak and defenceless. But just after the close of the action an express arrived from General McDowell, with a letter to him from Governor Caswell¹⁴ informing of the defeat on the 16th of our Grand Army under General Gates near Camden. In this situation to secure a safe retreat was a most difficult task our small party broke down with fatigue two hundred british prisoners in charge, upwards of forty miles advance of General McDowell who retreated immediately and dispersed upon the receipt of the news of Gates defeat— Ferguson with 3000 men almost directly in their rear. It required all the Vigilance and exertion which human nature was capable of to avoid being cut to peices by Fergusons light parties— it was known to Col. Shelby that he had a body of dragoons and mounted men. That would endeavour to intercept him which caused him to bear up towards the mountains. The enemy pursued as was expected fifty or sixty miles, until their horses broke down and could follow no further— It is to be remarked that during the advance of upwards of forty miles and the retreat of fifty or sixty, the Americans never stoped to eat, but made use of peaches and green corn for their support. The excessive fatigue to which they were subjected for two nights and two days effectually broke down every officer on our side that their faces & eyes swelled and became bloated in appearance as scarcely to be able to see.

This action happened at the most gloomy period of the revolution, just after the defeat and dispersion of the American army, and is not known in the history of the Revolution; after our party had retreated into North Carolina clear of their pursuers, Colonel Shelby crossed the mountains to his own country— and left the prisoners taken in the action in the possession of Col. Clarke to carry them on to the North until they could be safely secured; he gave them up shortly after to Colonel John Williams to conduct them to Hillsborough in North Carolina, at this period there was not the appearance of a Corps of Americans embodied anywhere to the Southward of Virginia— In this action the Americans loss was small compared with that of the enemy who over shot them as they lay concealed behind their breast works. The loss of Capt. Inman was much regretted, he fell gloriously fighting for his country on the 19th of August, 1780, with many other brave spirits who volunteered their services on that occasion and defeated the enemy far superior in force to their own.

The defeat of General Gates, the surprise and complete dispersion of General Sumpter & dispersion of Genl. McDowell's Army, no appearance of an American corps existed to the Southward of Virginia, & many of the whigs from the Carolinas and Georgia with General McDowell at their head retreated to the west side of the Alligany Mountains for refuge, from a pursuing foe— It was at this

¹⁴ Richard Caswell (1729-1789), a native of Maryland, came to North Carolina about 1746. He was the first governor of the state, later served as a soldier, and was at this time again governor of North Carolina.

Gloomy period of the revolution that Colonel Shelby, Colonel Sevier, Colonel Campbell¹⁵ and General McDowell who had fled to their country began to concert a plan for collecting a force & making a forced march to surprise Major Ferguson with his party who had advanced up to the foot of the Mountains on the East side and threatened to cross over and lay waste the Country on that side for their opposition to his Majisties arms.

The Americans once more in pursuance of their plans which they had concerted on the Western waters began to collect on Doe River in the edge of the mountains that separates the Eastern from the Western waters about the 24th of September, 1780— at which place Colonel Shelby, Colonel Sevier & Colonel Campbell with their regiments and General McDowell with his followers rendezvoused, but previous to their march from Doe river it was discovered that a certain Crawford and one or two others had deserted to the enemy— They proceeded however on their proposed route to the top of the Yellow Mountain— but here it was determined in a council of officers as useless to attempt to surprise Major Ferguson, and they concluded to file off to the left— through mountains almost impassable, get in the enemys front and act as circumstances might enable them to do— fortunately on the first day they got clear of the mountains on the east side— They fell in with Colonel Cleveland an officer of great zeal in the cause of liberty, with 400 men, who had embodied in the Northern Counties of North Carolina, with a view to join any other American party that might be collected to oppose the advance of the enemy— The next day they also fell in with Colonel John Williams and sundry other field officers of distinction from So. Carolina, with their followers who had also advanced with a view to join any Americans collected to oppose the Enemy, having all together about four hundred men— The whole then moved on towards Gilbert Town where it was expected Fergusons Army lay— It was now discovered that the American Army thus accidentally collected without a head, was a mere confused mass, incapable of performing any great military achievement. The officers Commanding regiments assembled and determined that a Commanding officer was expedient, but the Senior officer of the army was unpopular and as the campaign was a volunteer scheme it was discovered that those who had the right to command would not be chosen— It was determined to send for General Morgan,¹⁶ or General Davidson,¹⁷

¹⁵ William Campbell (1745-1781) of Virginia, a noted Indian fighter, had risen to the rank of colonel. With a price placed on his head by Cornwallis because of his part in the battle of King's Mountain, he fought at the battle of Guilford Court House.

¹⁶ Daniel Morgan (1736-1801), a native of Pennsylvania or New Jersey, came to Virginia as a boy. He served in Braddock's expedition and in the later Indian war. He became captain of a Virginia company in 1775 and served in New England, becoming colonel in 1776. He served under Washington and under Gates, was promoted brigadier general in 1780, and commanded the American forces at the battle of Cowpens. After the war he served one term in Congress.

¹⁷ William Lee Davidson (1746-1781), a native of Pennsylvania, settled in Rowan

to take the command and General Charles McDowell proposed to undertake this mission and actually set out in pursuit of one of those Generals— During their sitting it was proposed that until General Morgan or General Davidson arrived that the officers composing that board should meet once a day & determine upon the movements of the army— this being agreed to, it was also proposed and agreed to that Col. Campbell should be appointed officer of the day to execute the plans adopted by the Commandants of regiments.

These regulations being adopted the army marched into Gilbert Town. Ferguson had left it two or three days. The Americans pursued upon his trail which appeared for some distance as if he intended to take shelter under the walls of Ninety Six— in order to move with greater velocity in their pursuit the American officers spent the whole of Thursday night in selecting their best men, best horses and guns, & by daylight on Friday morning were ready to pursue with nine hundred and ten picked men well armed and mounted on good horses— the residue about seven hundred of weak horses and foot men, were directed to follow as fast as possible— The Americans pursued hard on the Enemys trail all day on Friday without lighting until they arrived at the Cowpens just at dusk, here they killed some cattle, stayed an hour and roasted some beef then resumed their pursuit. The night was very dark but it was discovered that Ferguson had changed his route and that instead of Ninety Six, his object appeared to be to get in the rear of Lord Cornwallis, who lay at Charlotte, in North Carolina with the British Grand Army. —& that his making this circuit was merely to gain time to collect his Tories who had been suffered to go to their homes before it was known that the Americans had collected to oppose him— At the Cowpens Colonel Williams and his men left the Army & started just after dark to go to attack six hundred Tories said to be collecting at Major Geiles's but a few miles distant from that place. The Colonel was much importuned to abandon that object but refused in the morning however just at day light on the army arriving at the Cherokee ford of Broad River, Colonel Williams with his men came up in the rear this was a welcome sight as from the sign on the enemys trail the American army had gained ground greatly upon him and the conflict was growing to a crisis— This was Saturday morning and at sun rise it began to rain hard. The army however continued unremittingly to pursue its main object, traveled hard all day through the rain, until they got within a few miles of the enemy where he lay incamped on Kings Mountain, and where he had only arrived late the evening before— On gaining information of the position of Major Fergusons army, the American line of battle was formed as follows— Colonel Campbells regiment headed by himself formed the center column to the right Colonel Shelby's regiment commanded by himself formed the center column on the left.

(now Iredell) County, North Carolina, in 1750. He had served as major and lieutenant colonel of the Fourth North Carolina Regiment and had just been promoted brigadier general. He was killed at Cowan's Ford.

The right wing was composed of Colonel Sevier's regiment, Col. McDowell's regiment, Col. Winston's regiment & commanded by Col. Sevier in front. The left wing was composed of Col. Cleveland's regiment, Colonel Williams's regiment, Colonel Lacy's¹⁸ regiment & Colonel Brannums¹⁹ regiment, & headed in front by Col. Cleveland²⁰ himself, in this order the American Army advanced in four lines until it arrived in sight of the Enemy's Camp on Kings Mountain at three o'clock in the afternoon of Saturday the 7th day of October, 1780. The two center columns then wheeled to the right and left formed a front, marched up and attacked the enemy, while the right and left wing were marching round. The action then became general and lasted one hour and a half. The Americans had upwards of sixty killed and wounded— and they killed and took of the Enemy eleven hundred and five— three hundred and seventy five of them were left weltering in their Gore upon Kings Mountain, among the latter Major Ferguson himself, he fell in the close of the action— about the same time or shortly before Colonel Williams was mortally wounded of which he died.

The American Arms from this period was successful to the end of the revolution. In November of 1781, General Mifflin²¹ rec. information that 4 or 500 Hessians in Garrison at Colliton Hall near Monks Corner, were in a state of insurrection he detached Col. Mayam of the Dragoons, Colonel Shelby and Colonel Sevier, with a party of eight hundred men to attack the post. The party was commanded by Colonel Mayam.²² They appeared before the British Garrison early on the 26th day of November, 1781. The Hessians had been sent to Charlestown the day before, under an apprehension of their disaffection. But the British in the Garrison amounting to one hundred and fifty surrendered at discretion, under the impression that the Americans had Artillery— This post was six or eight miles below the Enemy's Grand Army at Fergusons Swamp commanded by General Stewart.²³ The Detachment were all mounted and carried the prisoners by turns through the woods on their horses and arrived the night after

¹⁸ Edward Lacey (1740-1813), a native of Pennsylvania, saw service in Braddock's expedition and in 1766 settled in Chester District, South Carolina. He served with Sumter, fought in the engagements at Rocky Mount, Hanging Rock, Carey's Fort, and Fishing Creek, and rejoining Sumter, served with him to the end of the war. He moved to Tennessee in 1797 and later to Kentucky where he died.

¹⁹ Presumably Colonel Thomas Brandon (1741-1802), a native of Pennsylvania, who came to South Carolina about 1754. He served under Sumter and became colonel in 1780. He took part in the battles of Musgrove's Mill, King's Mountain, Blackstock's, and Cowpens.

²⁰ Benjamin Cleveland (1738-1806), a native of Virginia, had moved to Wilkes County, North Carolina, in 1769. He was active in the Revolution against the Indians and Tories and rose to the rank of colonel of militia. He moved to South Carolina after the war and there spent the remainder of his life.

²¹ Francis Marion (c. 1732-1795), the "Swamp Fox of the Revolution."

²² Hezekiah Maham.

²³ Colonel Alexander Stewart.

about one o'clock at General Marians headquarters in the Swamp of the Santee river, at the distance of near fifty miles from where the British surrendered.

General Stewart sent a strong detachment to regain the prisoners but could not come up with them.

The Enemies whole army retreated to Charlestown two days after the reduction of the post at Colliton Hall and never came out again during the Revolution.

ARKANSAS TRAVELER, 1852-1853: DIARY OF JOHN W. BROWN

Edited by HORACE ADAMS

The diary of John William Brown serves as an accurate mirror of Southern ante-bellum life. While the document sheds light on many phases of Southern society, the excerpts presented here have been selected in order to depict the vicissitudes of an Arkansas traveler during the years 1852 and 1853. Brown, originally from Shelby County, Tennessee, resided on a farm located near Princeton, Arkansas. During a ten-month period, August, 1852-May, 1853, he found it necessary to visit Memphis twice and New Orleans once. The first journey to Memphis from the vicinity of Princeton, by way of Little Rock in a mule-drawn barouche, consumed twelve days of travel and a total of \$25.47. His oldest daughter, Margaret, accompanied him. The following excerpts tell the story.

[August, 1852.] Monday 23 This is a morning of bustle in the camp. W. Ann H. & H.¹ all starting early on horseback to school—to ride 4½ miles—Margaret and me packing up for our Journey took our leave about 10 o'clock in the baruch, drawn by the mule Jack. Went to Mr. Byrd's and took dinner and had the mule shod— Thence on to Tulip, got some articles of merchandize and to M. Smiths for the night. . . . Spent the night very pleasantly and in fine spirits. A very warm day. Thom² drove us and returned home

Tuesday 24 Started after breakfast and went only to Claudys. Rain in the middle of the day but we happened to slip between the Clouds— Saw Hals Sheriff of Hot Springs & he promised to hold up my taxes till term of settlement

¹ The children in order of birth were: William, Margaret, Hugh, Anne Hawes, Dick, Clara, and Ed.

² A Negro slave.

Weddy 25 Margaret the evening before had dropt her bonnet & veil out of the Baruch & did not discover it. I got a horse this morning and went back 8 miles where a traveller had been good enough to deposit them— I returned got breakfast, paid bill \$1.50 boys 25cts and travelled to Col Dodds for the night— Saw Pack She[ri]ff Saline and got taxes deferred for the time. Paid 50cts ferriage at Saline and spent a dime at Benton.

Thursday 26 Paid Bill \$1.00 and moved on very laboriously to Little Rock. Put up at the Anthony house and passed the evening and night happily— Attending to Margt and preparing . . . for to morrow.

Friday 27 Had the harness padded 25 cts. . . . In the evening paid Bill \$3.25 and left well satisfied. Pd ferriage and went 3 miles to Douglass— pd. servts 30 cts—

Augt Satdy 28 Paid bill 1.50 and travelled to Brownsville to Barksdale tavern. Found that an 80 acre tract of land in Prairie county which had been sold for the taxes could be straitened out and Williams the Clerk promised to send me a statement of it and assist in getting it fixed. . . . pd 25 cts turnpike [toll]

Sunday 29 Paid bill 1.50 and went to Parson Gamts, on the other side of the Prairie— Stopped early in the evening hot and fatigued and enjoyed our rest.

Monday 30 Paid bill 1.50 and went to Cauly's for the night— ferriage at white river 70 cts. fell short of the stand we aimed at and lodged among sickness and poverty

Tuesday 31 Bill 1.00 and went to Marlers eight miles to a late breakfast. Bill 75 cts and thence to Barnetts for the night. Two turnpikes on Long Eil 90 & 87½ [cents] bad roads most of the way from White River— We rejoiced to be getting far on our way—but slowly

Wedday 1st Sept. Bill 1.50 and thence across Crowley's ridge to Mr Jones for the night Another accident today. the weather was hot and labor of driving my mule severe I put off my coat and it was lost out of the open baruch— Here I was without a coat. I intended on going back in the morning, but a traveller saved me the trouble and sent it back from the next house by a servant, to whom I pd. a quarter

Thursday 2nd A rainy morning. After enjoying the hospitality of my old acquaintance Jones in his fine house we set out in the rain— Crossed St Francis— ferriage 50 bought umbrella 75 cts at the river and started into the swamp which was exceedingly bad for the season of the year. We made it about 7 miles—then hired a pilot and two horses— Margaret mounted, and we lightened out what we could on the horses and I drove through nearly up to the hubbs a great deal of the way to Blackfish lake thro rain, mud & water— Crossed lake ferriage 45 cents—10cts for some hay. 10 cts for a glass toddy and went on to Mrs . . . 6 miles pilot 1.50

Friday 3 Bill 1.50 and ferriage Mi³ 1.50 one watermelon 10 cts glass toddy

³ Mississippi.

10 drove on to Jas Keys . . . in the night. I now felt that I was in my old range and was no little gratified at it

Saturday 4 Bill 1.00 and reached Mrs Colemans about 11 O'clock where we found the old lady feeble and Just recovering from a long and dangerous spell of sickness. We however were much rejoiced to find her better and to enjoy a temporary rest from our fatigues and so closes a laborious trip out with a dull mule over bad roads in hot sickly weather with too much package for any one horse.

[Since Margaret remained in Tennessee, Brown made the return journey on horseback by way of Arkansas Post and Pine Bluff. The trip required eight days and cost \$7.60.]

[September] Tuesday 28 I took my leave of the family and rode to James D. Ruffins where I spent the night very pleasantly, . . .

Sept Weddy 29 Took an early start, now Jack & me for it home, went to Mr Mathews in Mi bottom paying 3 ferriages— Cold water 20 cents Walnut Lake 20 cents and beverdam 20 cts— very tired I got to my quarters half an hour after dark. Road tolerably soft

Thursday 30 Paid bill \$1.00 and went on 6 miles to Mi river—ferriage 75 cts— In paying bill this morning I lacked 50 cents which I left for Mathews with Evans at the Ferry by request of the landlady. I called at the swamp land office and got some information and examined the books and returned about an hour— Took some refreshment 15cts and rode on to Mr Alexn Graves, where I found him very sick

Friday 1 Went on and after a very fatiguing days Journey, missed the right place of taking off to Andersons ferry and went on to Redmonds near Lawrenceville—

Satday 2 Paid bill \$1.00 and went on, ferriage White river 25 cts and thence on to Browns in the Prairie— Ferriage at Le Greve 10 cts .

Sunday 3 pd. bill 1.00 and thence to the post of Ark. saw my agent Mr Haliburton, went to the Clerks office and made some examination, found my tax matters in bad fix left \$20. with him to endeavor to get it fixed up and after taking some refreshment, came on, crossed the river at Tedfords ferry 25 cts and got to Mr Douglass'

Monday 4 Started early because I knew their habit of late breakfasting— Could not make the change and left my bill of 75 cts unpaid— Rode to Richland a rainy day thro mud and rain— Took a glass or two of grog which warmed me up and rode on to Mr Atkins' a comfortable house and I spent the night pleasantly.

Tuesday 5 Paid bill 75 and came on to Pine Bluffs— Here was the first information I could get about my family and I was much rejoiced that all were well a few days past. After resting a short time I rode on to Mr Henrys for the night

Wednesday 6 paid Bill 1.00 and pushed for home— I was almost broke down

and had the longest days ride on the trip say 36 miles to make. But so great was my anxiety to get home that I made it before sun set and found all my little flock well— Now I am happy for the time at least and forget business cares. A long and rather perilous trip is over— A good deal of important business accomplished— . . .

[The second visit was made by carriage to Pine Bluff and from thence to Memphis by steamboat. The entries below begin after Brown reached Pine Bluff.]

[December, 1852] Thursday 9 Remained at the bluffs for the want of a boat until after supper paid bill 1.50 and got on board the Tiber. Mr. H. fortunately collected some money here which enabled us to go on without borrowing.

Friday 10 Sailed on without accident and we have a pleasant passage tho not very fast. The boat reached Napoleon about dark— Sailed up the Mi a short time and lay up— She is bound for Cincinnati. I am gratified we are out of the Arkansas river safe for it is the worst navigation and the boats of that river generally badly managed, as well as inferior boats

Satdy 11 Sailed until about 9 P. M. and again lay up— I prefer this for I am afraid of accidents at night. Spent 1 dime for a dram—

Dec. Sunday 12th Sailed on slowly against the current and landed at Memphis a little after dark— paid bill \$10 for passage— Went up to the Gayoso— Carried our baggage, obtained a good room with fire and I was well contented to be again on terra firma once more and had a pleasant nights rest, under the influence of the feelings which always excited in my mind cheerful and at the same time melancholy reflections arising from past scenes and reminiscences of the Chickasaw bluffs, as they were called when I first settled there

Monday 13 We arose early and had an early breakfast which I consider one of the best improvements in tavernkeeping of the present age which I find about Memphis. . . .

[Brown spent the remainder of December attending to business. He began his homeward voyage, January, 1853, with his daughter, a Negro, a mule, and the barouche.]

[1853] Satday 1st January— A cold morning and hard freeze introduces the new year— The old year is going to return no more— It has been to me rather eventful— I have paid off a good deal of debt and am nearer even with the World than for many years past. Still I have had and still have increasing responsibilities on account of the growth and education of my family— My dissatisfaction with Arkansas has increased— I feel that I am settled and my means invested and lying comparatively dead in the most hopeless portion of the U. S. and destined long to be so on account of the selfish and unscrupulous conduct of our public servants in power and the want of every thing like public spirit in the action of the people I mean the mass of the population—without commercial facilities, without capital without enterprize nothing, is too erroneous for them

to swallow, if it is only called Democracy by the leaders— The prosperity of the country is nothing compared with the maintenance of the party. And this consists of a few interested leaders and a mass of dupes among the majority of the people, who submit to taxes and all inconveniences sooner than offend or hold to accountability those who are every day ruining them entirely by the maladministration of the state affairs. I went out pretty early to Dr Fraziers where Margaret was— Got the Baruch & mule from the livery stable—Cockerils—pd. bill \$4.50. took our leave of the Dr & family whose kindness I take pleasure in remembering— took a little round of shopping and went to the S. Boat Seathers and procured rooms— I was taken with a chill soon after we got aboard and did not go ashore during the day— Indeed I was quite sick Several of our friends called to see us. We got our baggage boxes etc. mule & Buggy on and at night sailed from the fair city of Memphis on high water and a good substantial boat. I recd. my money which I had deposited at Memphis with R. A. Parker

Sunday 2 I awoke in the morning far advanced down the river. Indeed we landed at Napoleon 8 oclock next day and landed at Robonds Wharf Boat— a cold and windy morning and I was suffering with fever which had not entirely abated— I lay all that cold day shivering at a little stove in the cabin and suffered a great deal— I was however much relieved by the Company and kind attention of Margaret, took some light medicine and felt better in the evening. Passage on the Seathers for self, Marg, Thom, the mule & Buggy \$20. I rejoice however that I am getting back towards my little flock at home paid bill at wharf boat \$3.50, and left on the S. B. Umpire about sunset—

Monday 3 We sailed with some comfort all night and I find myself better this morning tho still laboring under the effects of a most distressing cold and much debilitated This is one of the coldest days of the season as well as yesterday. Our fare is good and we are doing well for the Arkansas river. I kept in the ladies cabin entirely— Indeed I was too feeble and chilly to go into the air.

Tuesday 4 Still sailing on up the river. About 1 Oclock we landed at Pine Bluffs after paying passage & freight \$6. each & 10 for Buggy & Mule & \$3.00 for Thomas in all \$25.00. A cold night & clear we got up to Whites tavern . . . I must confess my thankfulness that I had ended the perils of the waters, all without accident on the trip, and altho I am weak and my health delicate I feel that with care I can work our way home safely

[In April, 1853, business affairs necessitated Brown's journeying to New Orleans in order to sell his cotton and finance the ensuing crop. Farming operations were entrusted to William, and father Brown left home April 12. The entries below begin April 17 when Brown left Camden for the Southern entrepôt.]

[April, 1853] Sunday 17 Paid my bill at Sutherlands \$5.75 for self—and horse one night, having sent the latter up by Mr Mims the next day after I reached Camden, and went aboard of the Cora. She was unloading and loading all day.

Monday 18 We got under way on our trip, but made but little progress this day.

Tuesday 19 Sailing down the river pleasantly and cheerfully. We have several acquaintances and neighbors on board, Dr Smith, John Harris & others and the trip bids fair to be a pleasant one. The Captain Ruting is careful and clever, and our fare is pretty good I had a slight chill on yesterday and suffered a good deal—am quite wasted by it but to day I have missed it and feel much better.

Weddy 20 Sailed on as usual. my health improving.

Thursday 21 In like manner. much amused at the scenery, plantation improvements etc. What is called the coast is a delightful region on the Mississippi. We landed about an hour after dark at the City. paid passage \$8.00 and remained for the night on the boat. Weather dry and fine— The streets in good order etc.

Friday 22 Got up early went out and took a view of the City. Went to our boarding house to breakfast Oviatts on Canal street convenient to our business After breakfast went out and saw merchants Cherry Henderson & Co saw the state of my accounts and business, found all right and walked to various points in the City to ascertain where I should deal, learn prices, see what changes had taken place since I used to visit the City etc. etc.

Satday 23 In like manner. I enjoyed the fish lettuce & oysters exceedingly I made some purchases of some small articles for family use, my health is greatly improved and I am in fine spirits, cheerful and full of hope—was introduced by my friend Henderson to some wholesale houses, in view of purchasing

April 24 Sunday Spent the day first in going to Market places, where I was furnished with themes for observation and comment, in the variegated concourse of people and conditions, and quite surprized to find all the summer vegetables in abundance and fine perfection— Next a long walk up the City— Then to the arcade for lunch— Thence to my room for a lounge and reading the papers until dinner at three—Thence to the Cathedral, witnessing some of the singular ceremonies peculiar to that mode of worship— and taking a view of the towering edifice and gorgeous trappings by which it is decorated— Thence after a stroll on one or two streets to my boarding house for the evening.

Monday 25 Arose early went to market and bought oranges etc. to take with me to my family. After breakfast set out hurriedly to make my purchases for family use Bought my groceries, meat, etc. from or through Henderson, my dry goods mainly from Palmer,— Of the former my bills were some two hundred dollars & the latter about \$120 . . . I also obtained a letter of credit or authority to draw on them [Cherry Henderson] for \$800. on the faith of the next crop. Walked till I was fatigued in attending to my little purchases and business matters and retired at night to rest happily

Tuesday 26 Busy again—got my bills—had my articles packed up and sent to the boat and every thing ready for leaving— paid my bill to Oviatt \$1.50 per

day \$6.50 drew seventy five dollars from C. H. & Co and went on board with my neighbors & several other acquaintances, well pleased with my visit to the City, and leaving my business matters in as favorable a fix as I could have hoped for— My 28 bales cotton is not sold but hope it will do better as cotton is still slightly advancing. Late in the evening set sail on the Cora for home in fine spirits and bade farewell to the Crescent City with all its splendor and rich viands.

Weddy 27 Progressing on our way up the river—not very fast but comfortably and safely—no racing against time or other boats—no reckless indifference to the safety of boat & passengers— Every thing vigilantly attended to we have a pleasant trip

Thursday 28 In like manner—stopping however at various landings to put out freight.

Friday 29 In like manner— Fare good and I enjoy the time as it passes, especially as every revolution of the wheels is bringing me so much nearer my home and loved ones. My heart exults in the anticipation of a happy return home after a successful expedition, and ample supplies for the necessary wants of the season

Saturday 30 In like manner— Still in good health and spirits— paid passage \$8.00 & bill of freight \$18.50. Weather still fine and the freshness of spring breezes fanning us We did not get to Camden to night as we expected but are getting along towards it.

Sunday 1st May Landed this morning at Camden— I remained on board until I got my freight landed at Lone Pine— A wet evening— I remained on the Boat by invitation all night— Quite a storm and rain in Torrents. I slept soundly along side of the Bluff towering over our vessel while the lightnings flashed over our heads and actually shattered some of the pillars of a house on the eminence above and not far distant from us. I found Thom at the landing with the Waggon to take a load home

Book Reviews

A History of American History. By Michael Kraus. (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., 1937. Pp. x, 607. \$3.75.)

This general treatment of American historiography is a pioneer work. It deserves recognition as a useful and valuable contribution to historians and, especially, to graduate students in history. It includes the entire range of historical accounts from the discoveries of America to the recent works of living historians. The first five chapters trace to the middle of the nineteenth century the historiography of what became, generally speaking, the United States. Perhaps it is most useful in this earlier period in throwing light upon many of the less well-known writers. The literary historians are then described. Five chapters are devoted to "schools" of historians, and one each to Henry Adams, biography, and co-operative histories. Generally a few significant facts are given about the historian, followed by a brief summary and criticism of his works. Although there is a sameness to the summaries, they give indication of the industry of Professor Kraus in preparing this volume.

When an author has accomplished so good a piece of pathfinding, it is an unwelcome task to point out his shortcomings. However, it is only fair to recognize that this work in its present condition is not a final treatment of the subject. Criticism may, therefore, be undertaken in the hope that it may aid in revising the present or in the writing of a future work that shall prove to be more adequate.

The defects of this volume concern the organization of the material, the sufficiency of the description of the writers of the different periods, the understanding of the various historians and their works, and the inadequate treatment or omission of certain important writers. Although half of the book is devoted to the period since the rise of the "scientific school," it is questionable whether an adequate picture of the character and importance of that group has been given to the reader. The great extent of their collective contributions, the minute character of their individual efforts, and the necessity of revising the conclusions of their predecessors, make the task both difficult and important. The arrangement, according to "schools" in respect to the particular method or theory which its writers developed, is helpful in giving order to this great variety of monographic work. When the classification is faulty, the result is less than satisfactory. The inadequacy of the procedure seems most noticeable in the recent period, where the monograph holds almost undisputed sway.

Errors of classification may be noticed in the Colonial period. The English historians, George O. Trevelyan and John A. Doyle, may have excited the interest of American students in the English point of view, but they should not be included in the "Imperial School." If historians ever turn in their graves because of the misinterpretation of their work, there should have been heavy rumblings in the vicinity of the final resting place of Clarence W. Alvord because of the inclusion of Edward Channing in the "Imperial School," and the omission of Alvord. It is not incorrect to think of the latter as a "Frontier" historian, but his *Mississippi Valley in British Politics* is one of the more important contributions of the "Imperial School." Furthermore, if the work of this group of historians means anything it is questionable whether Channing's third volume remains "the best single volume" on the Revolutionary period (p. 442). Channing was a general historian rather than an authority on the Revolution. The absurdity of the classification is apparent when the author discusses Channing's volume on the War between the States in the chapter on the "Imperial School." A chapter on general historians might have included a more logical treatment of Channing that would more adequately evaluate his true achievement.

The almost total omission of the work of Claude H. Van Tyne is hard to understand. A separation of the Colonial historians into those who belonged to the "Imperial School" and those who did not, would have given the author a better idea of the significance of Van Tyne, who made an important attempt to synthesize the work of these two groups. Since the early Spanish accounts of explorations were discussed, one might expect some consideration of the work of William H. Prescott. In the recent period, the work of Mark Sullivan failed to receive appraisal. The space devoted to recent writers on the South, eleven pages, is not very ample. U. B. Phillips received two pages; T. J. Wertenbaker, a half page. It might also be noted, although not to criticize Professor Kraus, that the treatment of John Marshall has already been superseded by an article appearing too late for use in preparing this work.

Some of these criticisms may be differently appraised by others, but it is believed that the value and marked usefulness of this volume will be generally recognized.

Louisiana State University

JOHN D. BARNHART

Lawson's History of North Carolina. Edited by Frances Latham Harriss. (Richmond: Garrett and Massie, 1937. Pp. xxix, 259. Illustrations. \$3.00.)

John Lawson's history first appeared as a part of John Steven's *A New Collection of Voyages and Travels*, begun in London in 1708 and completed in 1710 and 1711. In 1709 Lawson's book appeared alone, followed by other editions in 1714 and 1718. It proved so popular that German editions were published in 1712 and 1722. The North Carolina legislature authorized a reprint of the book

in 1860, but this was very poorly done. The present volume, sponsored by the North Carolina Society of the Colonial Dames of America, is a copy of the 1714 edition. In a prefatory note, the editor gives a brief biographical sketch of Lawson and reproduces James Mooney's account of the route followed by Lawson on his journey from Charles Town to North Carolina. The greater portion of the volume is devoted to three chapters: "A Journal of a Thousand Miles Travel among the Indians from South to North Carolina," "A Description of North Carolina," and "An Account of the Indians of North Carolina." There is a reproduction of Lawson's map of the two Carolinas, a copy of his plate showing the "Beasts of Carolina," and six black and white prints from the John White paintings of Indian life copied from the original woodcuts by De Brys. Mrs. Harriss has not loaded the volume with editorial notes and has made no attempt to modernize spelling or punctuation. In a foreword, she "gives all the information necessary for a clear understanding of Lawson's text." There are few errors, and the volume has a more attractive appearance than any previous edition.

Lawson was an English gentleman of education, culture, and wealth. He arrived in Charleston in 1700 and shortly thereafter set out on a journey which took him into the Sound region of North Carolina. For ten years he was actively engaged in surveying and promoting the colonization of that province and was rewarded for his services by being made surveyor general of the colony. He seems to have been one of the incorporators of Bath Town about 1706, and in 1710 he assisted De Graffenreid in the founding of New Bern. In September, 1711, he was killed by the Tuscarora Indians.

The word *history* may be misleading as applied to Lawson's book. There is little discussion of political affairs, and the subtitle of the volume (*Containing the Exact Description and Natural History of that Country, Together with the Present State Thereof and a Journal of a Thousand Miles Traveled Through Several Nations of Indians, Giving a Particular Account of Their Customs, Manners, etc., etc.*) comes nearer describing its real nature. Lawson was a keen observer and a facile writer. His style was direct, vivid, and strong. A genuine sense of humor, much of it subtle, is in evidence throughout the book. There are interesting accounts of storms at sea; life at Charleston and in the French settlements through which Lawson passed; the customs and manners of various Indian tribes; and a long list of Indian words and their English equivalents. He gives a lucid account of the crops produced, methods used, and the nature of goods exported. He names and describes over fifty kinds of trees, thirty kinds of wild beasts, seventy kinds of birds, fifty-three kinds of water fowl, sixty-two kinds of fish, eighteen kinds of shellfish, and twenty-four kinds of "insects" (which included alligators, lizards, and all kinds of snakes). It is doubtful if there is to be found in print a more "particular" account of the customs and manners of the Carolina Indians than Lawson gave.

University of North Carolina

HUGH T. LEFLER

Dawn of Tennessee Valley and Tennessee History. By Samuel Cole Williams. (Johnson City: The Watauga Press, 1937. Pp. 495. Bibliography, illustrations. \$5.00.)

According to the preface of this volume, the author, whose writings in the field of Tennessee history are already very extensive, has marked out for himself a task of considerable size and importance. The work under review covers the period of Tennessee history from 1541 to 1775. In preparation is a companion volume on Tennessee during the Revolution, and there is projected a succeeding one on the history of the Southwest Territory. Including Judge Williams' earlier study, *History of the Lost State of Franklin*, the completed work will be in effect a four-volume history of the Tennessee country prior to the admission of the state to the Union in 1796.

In preparing the present volume, the author's avowed purpose has been to retrieve the Tennessee and Cumberland valleys and their aboriginal possessors, the Cherokee and the Chickasaw, from the comparative obscurity to which, apparently, Northern historians in general have consigned them. If any one thing is "clearly demonstrated by this work it is that these two nations of red men were highly efficient factors in defeating the strategy of France throughout decades before the French and Indian War and in that war which resulted in winning the Mississippi Valley, eastern part, for Great Britain." He has also attempted to correct the numerous errors of earlier Tennessee historians such as Haywood and Ramsey, who wrote without the aid of the rich store of archival material which has since come to light. Although the writing of history has been for Judge Williams more of a hobby than a profession, he has spared neither time nor energy in his search for archival material, and has succeeded in uncovering many hitherto undiscovered documents of importance. Several of these papers, discovered since the publication of his edited work, *Early Travels in the Tennessee Country*, are quoted at considerable length in the *Dawn of the Tennessee Valley*. Particularly significant is the diary of Reverend William Richardson, a Presbyterian missionary to the Cherokee, kept at the time of his visit to Fort Loudoun in 1758, on the eve of the Cherokee War. "The sulkiness of the chiefs and warriors which Richardson observed was as the oppressive lull that precedes a cyclone."

Extremely valuable, also, is the author's analysis of the early French and English maps of the Tennessee country and the Southwest. He believes that the English cartographers, including even Mitchell, were influenced too much by the earlier French maps, which were drawn with a view to extending as far north as possible the French claim based on the occupation of the Gulf region. The rivers flowing into the Gulf were represented as rising far up into what is now Tennessee; and the Tennessee and Cumberland rivers, since they were within the domains of the anti-French Cherokee and Chickasaw, were "flattened out" and minimized "to the point of absurdity." Judge Williams has also brought out

more clearly than any other Tennessee historian the significance of the fact that the major part of what was to become the state of Tennessee was included in the Granville district of North Carolina.

Throughout his work the author has devoted his attention largely to the political, military, and diplomatic aspects of history. He has developed in great detail the first explorations of the Tennessee country, the influence of the traders upon the relations between the Indians and the English and the French, the diplomatic and military significance of the Indian in the international rivalry for the control of the Old Southwest, the construction and location of the numerous forts in the Indian country, the development of colonization schemes and land speculative undertakings, the personnel and location of the first settlements, and the character of the first governmental organizations. It is to be regretted, however, that, probably due to the minute account of events, space could not be found for any detailed description of the everyday life either of the Indians or of the pioneer, thereby necessitating the omission of the economic and social effects of their interrelationship.

In organization, the work is strictly chronological. In the handling of "details of minor import," the author has adopted the unique procedure of incorporating them "in what may be termed sub-chapters, so that the general reader may, if he desires, glide over such details without any break in the sequence of the story." The work is amply documented and contains several valuable maps, facsimiles, and portraits. Through an unfortunate circumstance, however, no table of contents or list of illustrations is included. On the whole it is evident that, considering the years of research involved, beginning, according to the preface, in 1893, the care taken in the preparation of the volume is clearly indicated by its apparent freedom from factual errors. Written with the whole Southwest in mind, rather than Tennessee alone, it will serve as an invaluable reference work for all students of the American West, and it will provide Tennesseans with an interesting and definitive account of the origins of their state.

University of Tennessee

STANLEY J. FOLMSBEE

George Mason, Constitutionalist. By Helen Hill. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938. Pp. xxii, 300. Bibliography, illustrations. \$3.50.)

It is probable that, with the exception of Madison, no man had a more significant part in the constitutional beginnings of our government than did George Mason of Gunston Hall. In stating that until now the only published life of Mason was that by Kate Mason Rowland, the author overlooks entirely Robert C. Mason's *George Mason of Virginia, Citizen, Statesman, Philosopher*, which appeared in 1919. Nevertheless these two biographies have failed to bring him into the consciousness of the American people, a fact which Miss Hill attributes to the almost necessary anonymity of the *Constitutionalist*. In undertaking to remedy

that situation, she approaches her work with an able pen and a good understanding of the problems involved. She realizes that a biography must portray not only the man but the environment in which he lived, and that it should also interpret the public affairs in which he participated. Accordingly Gunston Hall and the Mason family are brought much into the foreground. Despite this, the personality of the Constitutionalist does not become vivid, nor does his domestic regime take on the aspect of actuality. But the Virginia society of which Mason was a part—Truro Parish and Fairfax County—is done in masterly fashion. Still more important, the constitutional and political problems with which Mason dealt are handled in a clear, concise, and intelligent manner.

The author, not being a trained historian, is prone to fall into error when she goes beyond the field of her immediate interest. She thinks that Governor Spotswood made the first exploration across the Blue Ridge; she has Céloron de Bienville masquerading as Blainville; she refers to the Germans and Pennsylvania Dutch who settled in the Valley of Virginia; and she speaks of the Mecklenburg County Resolves of 1775 as a constitutional document. It is true that these details are aside from the main purpose of the narrative, but they stimulate the careful reader's desire for more documentation. Especially would the reviewer like to know the author's authority for the very interesting statements regarding Benjamin Sebastian, who apparently is the same man who later became involved in the Spanish Conspiracy in Kentucky and about whose early life historians know little. Despite these faults, the author has shown discrimination in the selection of her material and rare skill in its presentation. The general reader will find it the most satisfactory account of the Master of Gunston Hall that has yet appeared, and the student will find many bits of interesting information. But Kate Mason Rowland's biography still remains the one for historians.

Mason's character presents no baffling complexities as does that of Jefferson or of Lincoln. This is probably the reason why his personality does not stand out more strongly. Yet his career does present some strange contradictions. In spite of a positive aversion to public office, he became a political figure of first importance; despite substantial wealth, his tastes were so simple that he scorned the punctillios of Philadelphia society. He was descended from a genuine Cavalier and was an aristocrat by tradition, but he was a sincere believer in the principles of government by the people; and though he was a practical and successful man of affairs, he lost ten thousand pounds as a result of the Revolution, and considered it a good investment. In order to understand these things, one must understand the Virginia of the Revolution.

University of Virginia

THOMAS PERKINS ABERNETHY

Anti-Slavery Opinion in France during the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century. By Edward Derbyshire Seeber. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. Pp. 238. Bibliography. \$2.50.)

This work, which is one of the Johns Hopkins University *Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages*, reveals a conscious attempt to minimize the historical approach. "These documents," asserts the author (p. 168), "historical rather than literary, will not be discussed in this study with the exception of a few written by men who have additional cause to claim our attention." Obviously it is the author's intention to bring in the historical only when its vehicle is literary (p. 9). But Professor Seeber's definition of "historical" is rather narrow, for in spite of himself his study turns out to be a valuable history of the development of an idea in varied forms over a fifty-year period.

Then again the author's definition of opinion is quite restricted. He does not try to sample all classes of opinion nor all regions of France. Neither does he study the cahiers, legislative debates, nor elections. In other words, Seeber limits his treatment to the antislavery opinions of the literary and philosophical élite of France. There is little attempt to suggest what, or how much, proslavery opinion existed at the same time. So we see antislavery opinion as in a vacuum with little relation to life or thought outside itself. However, if those limitations are kept in mind, the reader will find a very adequate account of the opinions of such important men as Montesquieu, Mirabeau, Voltaire, Raynal, Rousseau, Turgot, Du Pont de Nemours, Condorcet, and of many other lesser luminaries of the French rationalist constellation.

On the topical side the author discusses opinions on the Spanish conquests, the Negro race, legal aspects of slavery, humanitarianism, Christianity, economics of slavery, solutions for slavery, early slavery in the United States, the reform movement, slavery and the French Revolution, the "Noble Negro" idea, and the decline of the antislavery movement. The reviewer is particularly pleased with the topical treatment used by the author. By that method Seeber isolates all of the opinions on one subject, such as the economics of slavery, and puts them together in one chapter. The chapter on the legality of slavery seems especially good. On the other hand, the topical treatment leads to frequent repetitions where a quotation contains statements pertinent to several subjects.

In the reviewer's opinion too profuse use of French in the body of the text is the most unsatisfactory feature of the whole work. The usual practice of translating foreign quotations when they are used in the text itself is not followed. Instead, over two thirds of the page space is in French. When an author is dealing with opinion, he must, of course, quote more frequently than in another type of study; but Seeber has overdone quotations when he could have just as appropriately summarized many minor opinions. His insistence on the use of French quotations leads him into rather extreme practices. When English authors wrote

something in French, he quotes them in French (pp. 12, 22); he uses French when he injects parenthetically a few words of his own in a quotation (p. 39); in the midst of a rare English paragraph he suddenly uses a French phrase such as *bête de somme* when there is no good reason for not using the English expression *beast of burden* (p. 9); he frequently uses the French form of *assemblée nationale* in his English text and yet at the same time speaks of the Estates-General in the English form.

The bibliography is exceptionally good. The five hundred listed titles of books, pamphlets, and articles form a very useful guide for this type of literature.

Louisiana State University

LYNN M. CASE

Uncommon Scold: The Story of Anne Royall. By George Stuyvesant Jackson. (Boston: Bruce Humphries, Inc., 1937. Pp. 161. Bibliography. \$2.00.)

Anne Royall's importance for students of history is not her life, though interesting, but the writings she left—eleven volumes in all, mostly of travel. As the author justifiably points out, "what she left to posterity is information for the most part—information which could be used by the social historian because it could not be found elsewhere." She probably covered the United States more fully than any of the professional travelers of her period. Places, inhabitants, manners, buildings, and institutions all came under her sharp eyes. She had the reporter's instinct. A large part of her traveling was in the South. In 1813 when her wealthy husband died she left her home in the mountains of Virginia for Alabama, where she lived for ten years. She stayed in St. Stephens, Huntsville, and Melton's Bluff. The big landowner of Melton's Bluff was then Andrew Jackson, and it was here that Anne Royall got her first view of the Old Hero, for whom she had so much admiration. One of her books is entitled, *Letters from Alabama*. Three later volumes were also on the South. Mr. Jackson gives a list of her writings in his book.

For the rest of her long life Anne Royall lived mostly in Washington where poverty kept her publishing and ungenerous language got her into trouble. Her newspapers *Paul Pry* and the *Huntress*, published between 1831 and 1854, were the media for her caustic comments on the great and the near great of her time, all of whom she seems to have interviewed. She was a reformer in her fashion, enamored of Voltaire, Thomas Jefferson, and her late husband, William Royall, the large landowner of Sweet Springs, Virginia, but the things she wanted to reform were the hypocrisies of people. Her pet hates were the "Holy Willies" of the church, missionaries, nullifiers, "Bankites," temperance societies, and Anti-Masons. Her enthusiasms were Freemasonry, territorial expansion, internal improvements, Andrew Jackson, and the Union. Her enemies struck back by having her arrested for being a "common scold."

This is the second book on Anne Royall to be published. It does not supersede

the earlier one by Sarah Harvey Porter, published in 1909, but supplements it; documentation and a bibliography are provided which were lacking in the earlier work. The purpose of the author is a "revised interpretation" and a guide to those who may want to use the wealth of material in Mrs. Royall's books. The result is a useful, readable, and interesting biography. The interpretation is fair. This reviewer, however, finds it necessary to question the statement (p. 125) that Anne Royall was "the original American newspaper-woman."

University of Chattanooga

CULVER H. SMITH

Adventure on Red River; Report on the Exploration of the Headwaters of the Red River. By Captain Randolph B. Marcy and Captain G. B. McClellan. Edited and annotated by Grant Foreman. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1937. Pp. xxxi, 199. Illustrations, maps. \$2.50.)

The editor's title word "adventure" is fully warranted. The point can well be made by extracting from the table of contents such topics as Indian signs, rains, high water, Comanche signs, buffalo chase, prairie dog towns, panther killed, bitter water, intense thirst, bears abundant, horseflies, scurvy, old Indian villages, and cross timbers. The "pulp woods" would lose their appeal if we had more firsthand accounts of Indian guides like Marcy's Delaware who, from an Indian trail or deserted camp, could determine of "what nation they were; the number of horses and mules in their possession; whether they were accompanied by their families, and whether they were upon a war expedition or otherwise; as also the time (within a few hours) of their passing."

Not only is the journal an interesting record of adventurous days but it presents a vast amount of careful description concerning the geography, geology, and anthropology of the region explored. As the editor points out, Marcy's predictions concerning the future of this region were "surprisingly accurate."

The 177-page narrative report based on the day by day journal of Captain Randolph B. Marcy, was printed in 1853 as a United States Senate *Executive Document* (32 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 54), and also as a United States House *Executive Document* (33 Cong., 1 Sess., unnumbered). As the editor notes in his 18-page introduction, the 200 remaining pages of the original report, the 2 maps, and the 63 plates, may have some interest to the student and the bibliophile; these are satisfactorily outlined in the introduction. The map showing the route followed, the region explored, and the encampment dates is so slipped in this volume, that the reader may follow both the text of the journal and the map without difficulty.

Marcy relates that during three years exploration (1849-1851) in the Canadian River country of the Arkansas and upon the upper waters of the Trinity, Brazos, and Colorado rivers of Texas, he had considered the "remarkable fact that a portion of one of the largest and most important rivers of the United States . . . remained up to that late period wholly unexplored and unknown, no

white man having ever ascended the stream to its sources." With his company (in the Fifth Infantry) and the services of Brevet Captain G. B. McClellan, Corps of Engineers, the expedition took off from the mouth of Cache Creek on Red River May 12, 1852. It moved up the north bank of Red River, turned north to follow the North Fork, crossed it on June 2, again on June 5, and a third time near the headwaters on June 14. By June 16 the expedition had reached the edge of the Llano Estacado. Marcy went directly north from this point crossing the Fort Smith and Santa Fe Road to determine the distance from Canadian River. The expedition then moved south, along the edge of the staked plains to the Ke-che-ah-qui-ho-no or Prairie Dog town branch, the main stream of Red River. A portion of the force moved up to the headwaters, far into the Llano Estacado. The expedition then moved down river on the north side, crossed the North Fork on July 11, followed the Wichita Mountain range, and arrived at Fort Arbuckle by passing through the cross timbers on July 28. Marcy revealed by this expedition the existence of two major branches of Red River. His view that the south branch was the main river was eventually adopted in the famed case of *United States v. Texas* which settled the Oklahoma-Texas boundary question.

The volume is well printed with but minor exceptions (see p. xxi, l. 1). A better index would have enhanced the value of the volume materially. There might possibly be some question concerning the publication of a journal which has already seen the printed page when so many hundreds of manuscripts are yet in their original form.

Historical Records Survey

JOHN C. L. ANDREASSEN

The Civil War in the United States. By Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Edited by Richard Enmale. (New York: International Publishers, 1937. Pp. xxv, 325. \$3.00.)

This book is a compilation of interpretative newspaper articles by Karl Marx and extracts from a voluminous correspondence between Marx and Engels on various phases of the Civil War in the United States. Among the articles are seven written in London by Marx for the New York *Daily Tribune* and thirty-five written by him in collaboration with Frederick Engels for the Vienna *Presse*. These newspaper accounts covered the period from September, 1861, to December, 1862. The *Daily Tribune* articles explained to American readers British reaction to the Civil War and more particularly the Trent Affair and intervention in Mexico. Much of the same material was covered for the Vienna *Presse*.

The correspondence between Marx and Engels includes sixty-one letters and dispatches, the first one dated January 11, 1860, and the last April 23, 1866. In their comments on conditions in the United States these friends revealed a sympathetic interest in the North. It would have been well if the editor had indicated clearly the respective places of residence of the two correspondents.

Mr. Enmale claims too much when he says in the introduction that "the present volume serves not only to disclose the limitations inherent in the liberal bourgeois approach to the Civil War and the shallowness of the traditional idealistic interpretations of the subject, but also preserves the revolutionary traditions of that struggle from reactionary and conservative distortions" (p. xxiii). To live up to expectations, then, the book should clearly explain, for example, the change in the objective of the Lincoln government from preservation of the Union to total abolition of slavery. It is true that Marx recognized that such a change was taking place, for in the August 9, 1862, issue of the *Vienna Presse* he states: "So far we have only witnessed the first act of the Civil War—the *constitutional* waging of war. The second act, the revolutionary waging of war, is at hand" (p. 200). He fails, nevertheless, to tell the reader why, where, and exactly when the change came. This omission characterizes his treatment of the whole period. The preponderance of space devoted to the Trent Affair, to the exclusion of other events equally important, further typifies the book's limitations.

In his effort to expose the "shallowness of the traditional idealistic interpretations," the editor offers the Marxian version of the War. Marx holds that 300,000 slaveholders not only conspired against the Union but also hoodwinked a majority of Southern people into supporting secession. Thus instead of refuting the distorted and entirely too simple abolitionist explanation of the War, Marx accepted it, and Mr. Enmale's purpose is betrayed by the very interpretation he extols.

Although some of the theories advanced by Marx and Engels as to the significance of certain persons, events, and phases of the War are questionable, their writing still has considerable value because it was contemporaneous with the struggle. Their vision was clouded by an abolitionist bias, but often they made acute analyses of outstanding events and situations. Marx was particularly astute in this respect. His better contributions include an excellent summary of the legal questions involved in the Trent Affair, an explanation of French intervention in Mexico, a picture of British public opinion, and finally an analysis of the effect of the blockade upon the British.

The book is useful and stimulating to the student of the Civil War who seeks the point of view of other students living at the time of the conflict, but it should not be considered an adequate and balanced treatment of the period as a whole.

Allegheny College

EDWIN B. CODDINGTON

Two Soldiers: The Campaign Diaries of Thomas J. Key, C. S. A., Dec. 7, 1863-May 17, 1865, and Robert J. Campbell, U. S. A., Jan. 1, 1864-July 21, 1864. Edited by Wirt Armistead Cate. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. xiii, 277. Illustrations. \$2.50.)

In editing the diaries of a Confederate and a Federal officer and bringing these

Mr. Enmale claims too much when he says in the introduction that "the present volume serves not only to disclose the limitations inherent in the liberal bourgeois approach to the Civil War and the shallowness of the traditional idealistic interpretations of the subject, but also preserves the revolutionary traditions of that struggle from reactionary and conservative distortions" (p. xxiii). To live up to expectations, then, the book should clearly explain, for example, the change in the objective of the Lincoln government from preservation of the Union to total abolition of slavery. It is true that Marx recognized that such a change was taking place, for in the August 9, 1862, issue of the *Vienna Presse* he states: "So far we have only witnessed the first act of the Civil War—the *constitutional* waging of war. The second act, the revolutionary waging of war, is at hand" (p. 200). He fails, nevertheless, to tell the reader why, where, and exactly when the change came. This omission characterizes his treatment of the whole period. The preponderance of space devoted to the Trent Affair, to the exclusion of other events equally important, further typifies the book's limitations.

In his effort to expose the "shallowness of the traditional idealistic interpretations," the editor offers the Marxian version of the War. Marx holds that 300,000 slaveholders not only conspired against the Union but also hoodwinked a majority of Southern people into supporting secession. Thus instead of refuting the distorted and entirely too simple abolitionist explanation of the War, Marx accepted it, and Mr. Enmale's purpose is betrayed by the very interpretation he extols.

Although some of the theories advanced by Marx and Engels as to the significance of certain persons, events, and phases of the War are questionable, their writing still has considerable value because it was contemporaneous with the struggle. Their vision was clouded by an abolitionist bias, but often they made acute analyses of outstanding events and situations. Marx was particularly astute in this respect. His better contributions include an excellent summary of the legal questions involved in the Trent Affair, an explanation of French intervention in Mexico, a picture of British public opinion, and finally an analysis of the effect of the blockade upon the British.

The book is useful and stimulating to the student of the Civil War who seeks the point of view of other students living at the time of the conflict, but it should not be considered an adequate and balanced treatment of the period as a whole.

Allegheny College

EDWIN B. CODDINGTON

Two Soldiers: The Campaign Diaries of Thomas J. Key, C. S. A., Dec. 7, 1863-May 17, 1865, and Robert J. Campbell, U. S. A., Jan. 1, 1864-July 21, 1864. Edited by Wirt Armistead Cate. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. xiii, 277. Illustrations. \$2.50.)

In editing the diaries of a Confederate and a Federal officer and bringing these

diaries into juxtaposition Mr. Cate has accomplished something unusual and valuable. Captain Key, the Confederate diarist, kept a portion of his notes in the diary book of the Federal Captain Campbell after the latter was captured in the battle of Atlanta. This again is something unique.

The lighthearted young Captain Campbell registers few heartthrobs in his sketchy diary. He regrets the death of his comrades, of course, but the deeps are not stirred. His home, his family, his friends, and his sweetheart are far back in Iowa, safe from fire, sword, and pestilence. His own life, as a soldier, is at stake; but one learns anew from reading these two diaries that a soldier's life in itself is a small stake compared to other things that are endangered in war. It is these "other things" felt by Captain Key and not by Captain Campbell that profoundly move the heart. A few quotations from the two diaries will demonstrate this better than anything that the reviewer can say. Let us take some entries made while Captain Campbell was marching with Sherman's army in Mississippi, almost unopposed, as it burned town after town and plantation home after plantation home during the winter of 1864.

"February 12th . . . march 14 miles and bivouac at Decatur; town most all burned up."

"February 15th. Start at 7 A.M.; it rains very hard; we march 9 miles; arrive at Meridian at 12 M.; and we are quartered in houses; plenty of forage; see 16th corps; Rebs in full retreat; nights cold; town destroyed, also railroad.

"February 16. 4th division starts at 7 A.M.; fine day; we march to Enterprise, 20 miles; halt 6 P.M.; camp on Chickasha River; eat; drive out the enemy; boys burn town and destroy R.R.; plenty of forage; quite lively time."

Campbell's tone is that of Bruno Mussolini who doubtless is a model youth and who probably is most polite to the ladies. It will be recalled that Bruno recently published a book in which he spoke of the poetry and beauty of dropping poison gas and bombs upon the noncombatants of the Ethiopian villages and towns. Town after town, house after house, the Federals plundered, wrecked, and burned, and the young diarist records that a good time was had by all. His spirit is gay and there is no touch of vindictiveness. His is the type of pleasure boys derive from burning woods and brush in quest of wild game. He merely enjoys the thrilling spectacle of burning cities. The brittle sound of shattered china and window panes is fascinating. There is something efficient and compelling in chopping up pianos, sideboards, and mahogany tables, and the splintering of slender-legged desks and high-backed chairs. At this point the editor quotes General Sherman on the burning of Meridian. The same joyful tone is there, except of course, it is more heroic. Sherman described the Meridian expedition as a "pleasure excursion." The General wrote: "For five days 10,000 men worked hard and with a will in that work of destruction, with axes, crow bars, sledges, clawbars, and with fire, and I have no hesitation in pronouncing the work as well done. Meridian no longer exists."

The diary of Confederate Captain Key is the record of a sensitive, religious, and deeply emotional man who not only stakes his own life in battle, but knows that the lives of his wife and children, of his father and mother, and of all those at home are in danger. These are those "other things" which far outweigh the more personal risk of battle. He knows that they may be subjected at any moment to any kind of brutality, that they are being robbed, burned out, and harassed by the invaders and their Negro allies. As the army of Sherman forces the army of Johnston back toward Atlanta, Captain Key witnesses and feels the horror of fire and pillage. What Campbell objectively describes in the excerpt concerning the burning of Mississippi, Key sees and feels on the long retreat through Georgia and on his march with Hood's army back to Tennessee in the fall of 1864. Let us quote from his diary which begins at Tunnel Hill, Georgia, December 7, 1863. Here Johnston faced the Federal army, soon to be commanded by Sherman.

"December 12. Kept my tent most of the day, being unwell and the weather inclement. Read the miscellaneous writings of Bishop Morris. . . .

"December 13. Having orders to build sheds for my horses, the men have worked untiringly for three days. I ordered no work to be done this day, since it is God's Holy Sabbath. In addition to reading my testament, I looked over the lectures of Bishop Morris and the newspapers."

"December 24. . . . It is Christmas Eve. I am sitting in my little cabin and my thoughts carry me away to Helena [Arkansas] where I see my good wife before the fire with three children around her, the eldest standing and looking earnestly into her face, the second a boy five years old, sitting in a small chair looking into the fire; and the youngest a girl about four, leaning on her mother's lap—all listening attentively to what their intelligent mother is relating in regard to the visit of Santa Claus. . . . Ah, will these little innocents not be disappointed? Their father has not seen them for twenty months, and is now far away battling for home and liberty, and has no means by which he can convey them toys or money to purchase them. Whether their mother has the means to spare in procuring Christmas presents for them is unknown to me, but I pray heaven to provide her with the necessities of life, and to bless and cheer the young innocent hearts of my children during the Christmas holidays. Happy Christmas to my wife and children!"

These diaries are among the most important Civil War journals that have been published, and Mr. Cate has done an excellent job of editing.

Vanderbilt University

FRANK L. OWSLEY

'Ware Sherman, A Journal of Three Months' Personal Experience in the Last Days of the Confederacy. By Joseph LeConte. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1937. Pp. xxxi, 146. Illustrations. \$1.50.)

An interesting but not at all significant little volume, *'Ware Sherman*, is a first-

hand account of the odyssey of Joseph LeConte during the expiring months of the Civil War. At the outbreak of the war LeConte was professor of chemistry and geology in South Carolina College at Columbia. When the college closed, he turned his attention to manufacturing supplies for the Confederate army, and in 1864 was appointed consulting chemist to the Confederate States Nitre and Mining Bureau with a laboratory on the campus. His widowed sister, two nieces, and a daughter were living on his plantation in Liberty County, Georgia, when Sherman's army came through. Alarmed for their safety, LeConte secured a leave in December of 1864 to go to them. The present journal covers the period from December 9, 1864, when he made his initial departure from Columbia, to March, 1865, when he returned to find the city in ruins. In the meantime, undergoing hardships which would have been fatal to the ordinary academic man, he moved his loved ones and his goods from Georgia to South Carolina; shipped the Nitre and Mining Bureau equipment to Richmond when Columbia became untenable; carted his valuables out of the doomed city in an effort to save them; stood by while his wagons were looted and his manuscripts and lecture notes were burned by Yankee soldiers; and barely escaped capture as a Confederate "brain truster" only to return to Columbia and find that his property there had been untouched by the invaders.

The journal was originally written on scraps of paper as the events transpired, and subsequently revised. A consequent confusion in tenses gives a decided *ex post facto* tone to the whole. Inasmuch as the heart of the account has already been published in LeConte's *Autobiography*, it is difficult to see how this volume is justified. Certainly it adds little, if anything, to historical knowledge. Included in the book are an incisive preface by Harold A. Small, a largely unrelated "Introductory Reminiscence" by LeConte's daughter Caroline, a series of freehand illustrations taken from the original manuscript, and a one and one-half page personal index.

Colgate University

CHARLES R. WILSON

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Greenville Ladies' Association in Aid of the Volunteers of the Confederate Army. (Trinity College Historical Society, *Historical Papers*, Series XXI.) Edited by James Welch Patton. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1937. Pp. 118. \$1.00.)

The Minutes of the Proceedings of the Greenville Ladies' Association in Aid of the Volunteers of the Confederate Army, preserved in manuscript by the late Mrs. C. M. Landrum of Greenville, South Carolina, serve to resurrect a forgotten chapter in the history of the Confederacy. It is known that there were numerous associations of ladies in the Confederacy engaged in the work of hospitalization and of assembling and forwarding supplies of food and clothing to the Confederate soldiers; however, until the publication of the Minutes of the Greenville

Ladies' Association, no printed record of the activity of these associations was available.

The records of the Greenville Association are nearly complete from the time of the establishment of the Association in July, 1861, until its quarters were plundered by a detachment of Stoneman's raiders in May, 1865. The objects of the Greenville Association were "to relieve the sick and wounded among the soldiers by forwarding to them linen, underclothing, cordials, bed ticks, socks, et cetera; secondly, to make winter clothing for the volunteers in the Confederate Army." The full extent of the activities of the Greenville group cannot, however, be gathered from the initial statement of purpose. The records show that the organization contributed medicines, foodstuffs, and money along with numerous miscellaneous items, such as soap and bandages. Besides soliciting, assembling, and forwarding supplies for Confederate hospitals and for Confederate soldiers in active service, the Association maintained on the campus of the present Woman's College of Furman University the Greenville Soldiers' Rest—a wayside hospital for the care of sick, wounded, and stranded Confederate soldiers. The Rest also supplied soldiers on furlough with both lodging and money.

The directresses of the Association, sixteen in number, met weekly in Mr. McDavid's store "to cut garments for the other members of the Association to make up." General meetings of the full membership were held "every first Saturday in the month." The initiation fee was twenty-five cents and the monthly due ten cents for every member. Apparently, every family of means in the town was represented by one or more members.

The volume contains a table of contents, an introduction by the editor, and an appendix prepared by the late Mrs. Landrum. The organization of the records is commendable and the footnotes are adequate.

Furman University

ROSSER H. TAYLOR

The Hidden Lincoln, From the Letters and Papers of William H. Herndon.

Edited by Emanuel Hertz. (New York: The Viking Press, 1938. Pp. 461.

Illustrations. \$5.00.)

This publication defies classification. Undoubtedly there has never been anything quite like it before and students of history will probably hope that they will not again be inflicted with such a confusion of poor form, bad taste, and valuable biographical materials.

If the volume is a collection of edited letters, the editorial work is confined to a pugnacious and eulogistic introduction of twenty-four pages and to a mere dozen brief explanatory notes. None of the information which scholars have a right to expect from an editor is provided. Letters to and from Herndon as well as statements and disconnected notes are merely printed. We are not told whether Herndon's letters to his correspondents are printed from letter books, from first

drafts corrected by Herndon or possibly Hertz, or from the originals which may have been returned to the writer. The reader may infer that these letters are a selection from the Herndon-Weik Papers at the Huntington Library. Is this a correct deduction or are some of these materials to be found only in private collections? If so, where? Are there any other manuscript depositories containing a considerable number of Herndon letters?

Likewise, this book cannot be characterized as a biography, since both Herndon the writer, and Hertz the "discoverer" of the letters, refuse to weave an integrated narrative but prefer to throw quasi evidence at the reader and let him interpret the materials as he may. While the reading public may relish this unusual privilege of wandering through an amazing compilation of factual evidence, second- or third-hand gossip, and mystical panegyric, it is obvious that lay readers may miss the guiding hand of the trained historian. If the public has acquired such consummate ability to weigh and synthesize evidence accurately, the members of the historical profession well might return to their original status as antiquarians, spending the years chasing down a multiplicity of unique facts which could be pooled periodically for the public's perusal. Mr. Hertz reveals his eighteenth century conception of the function of the biographer by saying: ". . . Beveridge did not possess the attributes that a devoted biographer of Abraham Lincoln ought to have. A true Boswell has one hero only, to whom he dedicates his entire life. Beveridge used only so much of the material as he saw fit—a shocking liberty to a genuine Boswell, such as Beveridge admitted Herndon to be" (p. 13).

After the introductory chapter the letters are arranged in two parts: the first, containing communications sent by Herndon to a variety of Lincoln students and enthusiasts during the years 1866-1891, while the second part, labeled "Evidences," contains letters and statements received by Herndon, as well as extended notes and summaries of experiences, testimony, etc., by Herndon. In a general way Part One, which is subdivided into five periods, tells the story of Lincoln's life to 1860, while the statements included in Part Two perform the function usually discharged by footnotes.

During the first years after Lincoln's death Herndon spent nearly every waking moment in the gathering of all types of evidences, statements, court records, and other documentary material on Lincoln's career to 1861. He also traveled many miles to interview persons who had known the former President in Kentucky, Indiana, and all parts of Illinois. He possessed an unusually retentive memory which played him false when dealing with the subjective qualities of his hero's nature, as he could not prevent the intrusion of his own religious and ethical conceptions. Sharing an office with Lincoln for many years, Herndon undoubtedly had an unparalleled opportunity to observe the moods and traits of his associate. In turn, exposure to Herndon's abolitionist principles may have contributed to Lincoln's education on the slavery question. Likewise, the younger man probably helped to sustain the political ambitions and prospects of the first Republican

President. However, the fact remains that Herndon did not begin to gather his Lincoln records until after his hero had been assassinated. Thus the interviews were obtained from ordinary citizens and minor politicians who suddenly found themselves important figures in the forging of the chain of Lincoln tradition. By 1866 Herndon found himself regarded as a fountain of knowledge on Lincoln. Correspondents asked for details on every phase of the War-President's career. Herndon enjoyed this opportunity to add to the glory of Lincoln's memory. He enthusiastically paraded the details of Lincoln's ancestry, religion, family life, premarital loves, as well as reading and storytelling habits. Above all else Herndon insisted on portraying the "truth" about Lincoln. This insistence on "truth" carried him into many disputes with Lincoln's uninformed worshippers and defenders. In these controversies his stubborn nature and fiery defense often led him into indefensible hypotheses about Lincoln's personal habits: many of which theories he abandoned in later life. These arguments also overshadowed his genuine admiration of Lincoln since the public could not follow the workings of a mind which felt impelled to parade sordid details in order to prove the greater glory of the final triumph of a great mind, personality, and soul.

The letters printed in Part One fall into five series: first, January 1866-November 1868; second, February 1869-January 1874; third, October 1881-March 1887; fourth, April 1887-October 1887; and fifth, October 1887-February 1891. The information offered in the first series to Charles H. Hart and Isaac N. Arnold is repeated in greater detail in the second series to Ward H. Lamon; also in the third to Jesse Weik, in the fourth to Henry C. Whitney and Truman H. Bartlett and, finally, in the last letters to Bartlett and Weik. Hertz feels that "their very repetitiousness is of significance in disproving the charge that Herndon's memory played him false." The tedious marching and countermarching of details, rumors, and beliefs over the printed page cannot be excused by any such easy explanation. The supposed accuracy of Herndon's memory disappears on an examination of his recollection of the price paid by Lamon for the "Records." On pages 61-62, Herndon records the sale price for outright ownership as \$4,000, while on 439 the price is \$2,000 with the proviso that some of the records were only loaned. In letters to Chauncey Black on January 4 and February 24, 1873 (Jeremiah S. Black Papers, Library of Congress), Herndon reported the price as only \$2,000 and insisted that he had merely permitted Lamon to use *all* of the materials. On January 3 of the following year, Herndon admitted to Black that he never had possessed a copy of the contract with Lamon and could remember nothing definite as to the details of the contract. Further evidence on Herndon's changing memories as to Lincoln's ancestry, habits, and a multitude of other items would come to light, were the letters in this volume to be checked with the twenty-five or more lengthy Herndon letters in the Black Papers. The correspondence between Chauncey Black and Herndon tells the story of a projected revision of Lamon's *Life of Lincoln*, with Herndon collaborating with Black. A study of

these letters reveals the one-track mind of Herndon, his unstable emotional harpings on Lincoln's personal habits and his inability to master the simplest of business deals as well as his incapacity for sustained literary effort. Mr. Hertz might have profited by a trip down from "a peak on Darien" (p. 20) to consult this valuable collection of Herndon letters. He might then have saved himself the mistake of referring to some of Herndon's sketches as "Herndon's draft chapters for Lamon's book" (p. 19).

What value then, have these letters of Herndon as "edited" by Hertz? True, they contain juicy details and spicy sidelights on Lincoln's human weaknesses as well as of his wife and boys. But Lamon's volume, published in 1872, even after some of Black's best writing had been deleted by the publishers, contained most of these lurid items, and, in addition, was woven into a rather substantial political and economic framework. Likewise, Beveridge used nearly all of Herndon's data which is usable in a serious biographical study. These letters are noticeably barren of any political importance. Finally, since Herndon was left behind in Illinois, no new insight is offered on the really significant years of Lincoln's life, viz.: his presidency.

Wilson Teachers College

ALBERT V. HOUSE, JR.

The Confederate Ironclad "Virginia" ("Merrimac"). By Harrison A. Trexler. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938. Pp. ix, 95. Illustrations. \$2.00.)

The author has presented an accurate and interesting history of the famous Confederate ironclad. One only wishes that he had seen fit to elaborate his work so as to make the story twice the length of the little monograph. The *Merrimac*, officially spelled *Merrimack*, was completed by the Federal government in 1856. In 1861 when the Confederate government seized the Gosport navy yard at Norfolk, Virginia, the *Merrimack* which was stationed there was burned to the water's edge along with other Federal naval vessels that could not be withdrawn. The Confederate government raised the hull of this vessel which had been one of the largest battleships in the American navy, cut off much of what remained of the superstructure and replaced it with a low, rooflike, wooden framework, solidly set up and covered by upright and transverse iron bars bolted through the timbers. The vessel was 275 feet in length, but when reconstructed as an ironclad 80 feet were cut down below the water line so that the ship furnished a much smaller target in every respect than did the original *Merrimack*. The engines and steering gear on the ironclad, rechristened the *Virginia*, had been seriously damaged by the salt water, so that the vessel had no speed and was incapable of accurate maneuvering. Nevertheless, on March 8, 1862, the *Virginia* steamed out into Hampton Roads and attacked the blockading fleet. In about two hours this slow-moving, lumbering monster sank the *Cumberland*, the *Congress*, and two

smaller vessels and captured another. The next day the *Virginia* returned to complete the job only to find the U. S. S. *Monitor*, which had been constructed to fight her, waiting in her path. Thereupon, on March 9, 1862, occurred the first battle between ironclads. Neither vessel was seriously damaged by the close range fire of the heavy guns. The battle was a draw.

After this battle the *Virginia* remained in the James River and prevented naval support of McClellan's army and forced him to alter his plans. In fact, it created a panic in military and naval circles of the Federal government. The author observes that Stanton and Lincoln not infrequently cast anxious eyes down the Potomac expecting to see the *Virginia* coming to take Washington. For a while it was feared that this awkward Confederate warship would place New York and Boston under tribute. Finally, Commander Josiah Tattnall sank the *Virginia* in order to keep her from falling into Federal hands, when he discovered that the river was too shallow to permit the passage of the vessel to Richmond.

Vanderbilt University

FRANK L. OWSLEY

The Collapse of the Confederacy. By Charles H. Wesley. (Washington, D. C.: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1937. Pp. xiii, 225. Bibliography. \$2.15.)

Opinions as to the collapse of the Confederacy agree on certain basic reasons for the final result, but vary widely as to the relative importance of these reasons. Most writers agree that the difference in resources in men, materials, and economic self-sufficiency was the basic cause. Dr. Wesley, author of the book under consideration, does not accept this conclusion, but rather attributes collapse, primarily, to the lack of unity in moral and physical support of the armies in the field. Such an interpretation confuses effect and cause. It is much like *Hamlet* without Hamlet.

In the spring of 1861, mob psychology controlled opinion throughout the South. Unanimity seemed to prevail everywhere. Soon, however, differences developed as to methods and means, though the end desired—Southern independence—characterized all factions. This difference of opinion, which constantly increased in degree and magnitude as the hopelessness of ultimate victory became manifest, was the result of many factors, among them, military defeat, diminishing resources, the clash of personalities, factionalism, and the growing conflict between state rights individualism and the more necessary federalism of vigorous centralized control.

For the first two years, Southern opinion generally supported the government and the armies without much questioning. Gettysburg and Vicksburg were decisive not because they were high watermarks of Confederate military effort, but more so because their outcome brought home to thinking men the enormity of the effort required to achieve Southern independence. There were later victories, but they were indecisive and did not do any more than repel an increasingly powerful

and well-fed opponent. After Gettysburg and Vicksburg many people began to look backward to the old Union rather than forward to the formation of a new nation. This attitude, slow to form in any extent, gathered in volume and force as Grant fought his way to Richmond and Sherman to Atlanta.

A year after Gettysburg and Vicksburg the defeat of the Confederacy was becoming manifest to those who would accept or admit the evidence. In another six months Atlanta had fallen, Hood's army had been destroyed, Lincoln had been re-elected. Lee's situation was daily more desperate. Defeatism had become rife throughout the South and men began to leave the armies not from lack of loyalty or from despair, but from an acceptance of the inevitable. Crushed by military might and economic power, the South, agricultural in its economy, was forced into submission. Had the military successes of 1862 been repeated in 1863 and 1864, defeatism would have been beaten down the moment it raised its ugly head. Lack of military and economic power were the cause of ultimate defeat; all other weaknesses developed within the Confederacy were the effect of this primary and fundamental cause. As in the human body, when the nervous and physical systems are weakened, conditions are created that make possible the development of internal ills that the body is powerless either to throw off or to overcome. Collapse, when it comes, occurs suddenly and completely.

Dr. Wesley reverses the above discussion. He sees defeat and collapse resulting from a lack of popular unity throughout the entire period of the War. The discussion is a compound of truths, half-truths, and dogmatic assertions. The author seems to sneer too much and too often at the "small group of leading Southerners" who, he states, formed the Southern Confederacy. He does not stop to identify and name them nor does he seek to explain how it came about that, under the circumstances, with slightly over one million men of military age, the secession states were able to put some 800,000 fighting men in the field and sustain a four-year war, albeit one of defense, against more than triple odds in man power and economic resources.

The discussion of the problems of the Confederacy and the growth of defeatism is unsatisfactory because it is without reference to chronology or geography, especially where quotations are made from private letters and official correspondence. This statement applies with equal weight to the account of food shortage, enlistments and desertions, scarcity of munitions, etc. Likewise, there is little relation of these discussions to the military situation. In fact, much of the argument is out of its context, so to speak, as seldom is any criticism or discussion related to anything else. The general intent seems to be an effort to show that the romanticism and glory of the Southern defense is *ex post facto* and not justified by events as they actually occurred. There is no recognition of the effect of Reconstruction in emphasizing and vitalizing this heritage. Without these memories, however true or false in degree, it may be asked what might have been the nature of the Southern recovery, even now still uncompleted.

The author considers the contest a "Rich Man's War," but fails to explain the support received from "the people." However, such a charge usually characterizes most "Lost Cause[s]." It is barely suggested that the small slaveholder and the nonslaveholder fought because of fear of the social and economic effects of free Negroes. Nor does the author admit that it is this very fear that, even today, keeps the South solid, at least as regards state and local government control.

The book includes four chapters on "Resources," "Politics and Society," "Popular Morale," and "Cotton and Slavery." There is a fifth chapter on the question of "Arming the Slaves" to which nearly one fourth of the content, including text and appendix, is devoted, an amount out of all proportion to its importance. There are notes, an extensive bibliography, and a serviceable index. There are numerous typographical errors, largely due to faulty proofreading.

The narrative is an interesting though somewhat lopsided study of the reasons for the collapse of the Confederacy. It will not serve to change the generally accepted opinion that the collapse was due primarily to the overwhelming force and resources of the Northern opposition. The related factors of popular morale, politics, society, etc., were as much responsible for defeat by superior numbers and resources as the latter were responsible for the increasingly negative characteristics of these related factors. The latter changed in degree and character as the hopelessness of military success became more apparent. Each affected the other and was responsible for the change in relationship. Military weakness and defeat begot defeatism which in turn acted further to weaken the military effort, and in the end complete collapse resulted.

And now, nearly seventy-five years after Appomattox, the South and the North have changed positions in respect to their attitude towards the functions and use of the national government, one of the fundamental causes of the Civil War. From being congressional, the North has become constitutional; the South has forsaken its former position as a champion of the rights of minorities and has become an equally ardent advocate of might makes right. And so the finger of history writes on, leaving a record for each generation to study and interpret, and to apply where possible to a solution of its own current problems.

Port Washington, New York

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

The Story of Reconstruction. By Robert Selph Henry. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1938. Pp. xii, 633. Illustrations. \$5.00.)

Having produced his *Story of the Confederacy*, seven years ago, Mr. Henry has continued his historical studies where that work left off, and now he has finished his *Story of Reconstruction*. The two are companion volumes, written in the same style and with the same mechanics of research. Mr. Henry has not sought to re-enter the thousands of firsthand sources, which have been used by numerous scholars in producing their excellent monographs on Reconstruction;

instead, he has with very considerable skill used their findings in constructing the story of the sweep of events throughout the whole South. Though he made some use of newspapers and other contemporary records, most of his quotations are not from the original but from its reproduction in secondary works. There are no footnotes to indicate exact sources, but a bibliographical acknowledgment gives the main works consulted.

This book is essentially a synthesis, skillfully and ably done. It can well be called a story for it is readable throughout; though it is not fast-moving, for it carries a heavy load of detailed facts. Indeed, it tends to break itself up into about a dozen stories, though merging in a general narrative, for every important movement originating in Washington or out is carried in its details through each state. In a sense it tends to become a compendium on Reconstruction.

The story begins with the Surrender and ends with the redemption of South Carolina and Louisiana in 1877. It is divided into three "books," Restoration, Reconstruction, and Redemption—in all fifty-one chapters. There is much more than politics and corruption in it—there are schools, railroads, cotton and cotton fields, fertilizer factories, churches, and the many other elements that enter into the full life of the people. Though more like Claude Bowers' *Tragic Era* than any other work in the field, it is more comprehensive and more judicious in tone. Thirty-one illustrations, all contemporary, greatly enhance the attractiveness of the volume, and a good index makes it more usable.

University of Georgia

E. MERTON COULTER

Negro Builders and Heroes. By Benjamin Brawley. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1937. Pp. xi, 315. Bibliography, illustrations. \$2.50.)

The most impressive characteristic of Professor Brawley's recent book is the wide range and the great variety of its subject matter. After preliminary chapters on Africa and the African slave trade, the author launches into an impressive series of short biographical sketches. His choice of individuals for portrayal includes such diversities as Revolutionary martyr Crispus Attucks and Reconstruction Senator Blanche K. Bruce, eighteenth century poet Phillis Wheatley and contemporary olympic speedster Jesse Owens, nineteenth century "Underground Railroad" Harriet Tubman and present heavyweight boxing champion Joe Louis, and eighteenth century astronomer Benjamin Banneker and modern educator Mordecai Johnson. Interspersed with the individual biographies are chapters on the gallantry of Northern colored soldiers in the Civil War, the work of Negroes in Congress during Reconstruction, and the achievements of Negroes in religion, in education, in the professions, in literature, in the fine arts, in science and invention, and in sports. The final chapters are devoted mainly to outstanding accomplishments of Negro women.

The best portions of Professor Brawley's book from considerations of both material and style are those which deal with Negro literary achievements. This is

doubtless attributable to the author's previous studies in the field of the literature of his race. Particularly good are the sketches of Paul Laurence Dunbar and Phillis Wheatley. Very readable also are the portraiture of reformer Sojourner Truth, preacher John Jasper, and educator Booker T. Washington.

The general readability of Professor Brawley's book is considerably impaired by frequency of direct quotation. Many of the quotations are long and tedious. Confusion is added by the failure to use indentation or reduced type for lengthy quotations. Tiresome also is the author's overuse of the words *thus* and *such*. In several instances *thus* appears twice in the same paragraph, and once, at least, it is used twice in the same sentence. The phrase "thus it was" is repeated frequently throughout the book. At times the author wearies the reader with prolonged detail. This is particularly true of the chapters on religious leaders and Negroes in professional pursuits.

Professor Brawley's book is also open to criticism on the subject of selection and emphasis. Questionable indeed is the propriety of including in the roster of "Negro Builders and Heroes" such pillaging and murdering insurrectionists as Cato and Turner, and such murder-bent characters as Gabriel and Vesey. Even more questionable is the author's devotion of more space to these insurrectionists than to men about the constructiveness of whose work there can be no doubt. What justification can there be for devoting half a page to Cato's insurrection and a half sentence to Paul Robeson's singing and acting? Why should two and one half pages be consumed in narrating the plots of Gabriel and Vesey when Countee Cullen and Langston Hughes together are dismissed with a lone short paragraph? What reason can there be for giving in a book bearing the title *Negro Builders and Heroes* six times as much space to criminal Nat Turner as to one of the nation's most eminent scientists of all time, George Washington Carver? One wonders also why no mention is made of the Reverend Isaac Lane, founder of Lane College and pioneer bishop in the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church.

Another defect of Professor Brawley's book is its lack of the critical quality. His treatment of most of the characters is entirely too roseate. The reader looks almost in vain for mention of some weakness or objectionable trait in this galaxy of heroes.

But notwithstanding these and other shortcomings, *Negro Builders and Heroes* deserves to be commended as a rich storehouse of information concerning many phases of the history of American Negroes.

University of Mississippi

B. I. WILEY

The Old Negro and the New Negro. By T. LeRoy Jefferson. (Boston: Meador Publishing Company, 1937. Pp. 118. \$1.50.)

Dr. Jefferson's book of 118 pages is divided into two sections. The first, captioned "The Old Negro," deals with American Negroes and some of their prob-

lems during the early decades of freedmen. The second, entitled "The New Negro," is not so much a depiction of the Negro of today as it is the portrayal of an ideal toward which the race should strive.

The author's basic theme is citizenship. He gives much sound advice as to the attainment of this goal. Professional men are urged to be honest. Business men are warned against extravagance. Teachers are enjoined from overemphasis of athletic activities. Preachers, farmers, editors, and politicians are also given practical suggestions as to ethics and procedure. All Negroes are urged to avoid extravagance in burying the dead, to be cautious in investing their money in fraternal organizations, and to refrain from going beyond their means in an effort to "keep up with the Joneses." Prenatal care, venereal diseases, marital faithfulness, and sanitation are also discussed in common-sense vein.

It is unfortunate that a book which contains so much that is sound and practical should be as replete with awkwardness and error as is this volume. Sentences are all too frequently involved and ambiguous. There are several evidences of slipshod proofreading. The second word of the opening chapter has a letter missing. There are four blank pages near the end of the book. There are several instances of the use of an incorrect letter in a word, such as *r* for *s* in *past* (p. 37). Misstatements of fact are not frequent. The reviewer, however, questions the authority of the statement that "men are capable of doing more work depending upon brain substance than women . . . the Creator intended that man was to be the leader or else both would have been created with average equal brains" (p. 74).

University of Mississippi

B. I. WILEY

Some Memories. By Thomas Frank Gailor. (Kingsport, Tennessee: Southern Publishers, Inc., 1937. Pp. xvii, 339. Illustrations. \$2.50.)

Memoirs, diaries, and the like have to be appraised differently than other works by the student of history. Arrangement, style, materials have to be accepted at face value, for the ordinary criteria of criticism do not apply. The reader may, however, judge of their contribution to general historical knowledge, their sidelights on major or minor events, the perspicacity of observation, or on the general philosophy of the writers.

Thomas Frank Gailor's *Memories* were written, according to the author's opening statement, to "leave a story" to his children and grandchildren. The anonymous editor or editors bring together an "Introduction" written by the Right Reverend James Craik Morris, bishop of Louisiana, a "Conclusion" by the Right Reverend Henry J. Mikell, bishop of Atlanta, and, as the bulk of the book, the "memories" themselves together with excerpts from a diary, kept with more or less regularity, appended to seven of the thirteen chapters into which the memoirs are divided. Two chapters contain "Some Sermon Notes," accompanied by diary excerpts written from 1926 to 1935, and "Some Letters of Thomas Frank Gailor."

Bishop Gailor lived from 1856 to 1935. Born in Jackson, Mississippi, his earliest boyhood memories were of the Civil War in which his father as a Confederate officer was killed at the battle of Perryville, Kentucky. Educated in private schools in Memphis and at Racine (Wisconsin) College, a church institution, he entered the General Theological Seminary at New York in 1876. At Pulaski he took up his ministry in 1879. Three years later he became professor of ecclesiastical history in the Theological School of Sewanee University, later the University of the South. In one capacity or another he was thereafter associated with this institution; from 1908 to the time of his death he was chancellor. Despite the fact that he became bishop-coadjutor (1893) and then bishop of Tennessee (1898), and was the first president of the National Council of the Episcopal Church, Gailor's first interest seems to have been the University. His episcopal duties took him far and wide, in the United States and out, but the University of the South stood foremost in his mind.

Gailor's simple narrative gives little inkling, except through incidental remark now and then, of the significant place he held in education and in the Church. His diary is even less revealing. Bishop Morris, in his "Introduction," however, more than strikes the balance; not only does he point out the pervading influence Gailor had in both fields but he maintains that the Bishop became "the chief advocate in America of Church schools and colleges." He preached numberless ordination and consecration sermons and found time to turn out several weighty volumes dealing with the Church and religious subjects.

The reader will be struck, I think, by the paucity of references in both the memories and the diary to current issues and problems outside those immediately connected with the Church. It is true that during the late war, at the onset of which the Bishop and his family were caught in France, there are some passing comments upon that cataclysm. So too, in the immediate postwar years the diary has a few observations about his work as conciliator in certain labor troubles. By and large, however, no one would gather from these pages that the Bishop realized that his country and the whole world were undergoing catastrophic changes. It is with personal experiences and with personalities that *Some Memories* particularly deal. Pertinent comments upon individuals, mostly ecclesiastical, whom Gailor encountered are scattered through the pages of the book, but, unfortunately, there is no index to help the reader find them.

Some Memories appear fittingly in a book of attractive format and excellent typography. Those interested in the Episcopal Church in America, in education in denominational schools, and especially in the University of the South will be glad the memories have been published.

University of Minnesota

L. B. SHIPPEE

COMMUNICATIONS

505 Walker Street
Augusta, Georgia

TO THE EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY:

As one of the small, very small guild of naval historians, I would appreciate your permission to intrude, briefly, my opinion of Jim Dan Hill's *The Texas Navy*, reviewed in your February issue by Mr. Schoen.

While Dr. Hill's admirable work concerning the influence of sea power on the achievement of Texan independence ably stands for itself, I feel impelled to question whether the review rests upon a sound understanding of the principles upon which sea power has, since remote times, certainly since the days of Xerxes, decisively influenced the course of history. There comes to mind that saying of the late Alfred T. Mahan, father of modern naval historiography: "Historians generally have been unfamiliar with the conditions of the sea, having as to it neither special interest nor special knowledge; and the profound determining influence of maritime strength upon great issues has consequently been overlooked." The reviewer's attitude toward the Texas naval establishment and its accomplishments might well have been inspired by the navy-hating Houston himself. In an apparent effort to belittle importance of sea power to the Republic, he seems to have forgotten that the size and number of ships and squadrons, as of battalions and brigades, are relative matters; and that what the enemy by our maneuver or situation is deterred from undertaking is often as important as what we do to him in combat.

The review neglects to mention the rôles played in the Gulf by the United States and French naval forces, which at times served Texan interests exceptionally well—factors fully set forth and interpreted by Dr. Hill for the first time. In fact, Dr. Hill's book is the first full-length history of Texas with particular reference to the effect of sea power. Dr. Dienst's four articles present neither an integrated narrative nor an interpretation, being antiquarian rather than historical writing. These valuable articles, however, do provide a proper departure for an account of the sea dogs of Texas, as the undersigned found some years ago when he used them to advantage in the preparation of a work on the bypaths of American naval history (three chapters of which were published as "The Sea Dogs of Texas" in *The Military Engineer*, November-December, 1936). Dr. Hill's researches extended far beyond the Dienst articles, as is clearly indicated in the broad scope of his documentation and his bibliography of works and materials consulted; yet there is a bland and unmistakable inference by the reviewer that the author merely wound these articles "around an undemonstrated and undemonstrable thesis." Whole chapters lie beyond the range of the Dienst study. From his researches in Mexico City he was able to correct, in at least one instance, the name of a Mexican vessel misgiven by Dr. Dienst, whose error the under-

signed confesses to have followed in his "Sea Dogs." Hill also, for once at any rate, followed Dienst perhaps too closely in the capture of the *Pelicano*, at least too closely to be perfectly in line with Cushing's *Wild Oats Sowing*, a rare naval memoir not listed in the bibliography.

As every mature writer knows, a critic may go through a book with a fine-tooth comb and by ignoring one set of source material and accepting another indict the author as being erroneous in any number of incidents; but unless the reviewer has spent a comparable amount of time in sitting as judge and jury on all the sources involved, he ought to approach his review with humility rather than casuistry. The undersigned believes that Hill's research was reasonably exhaustive; and that, dealing with many sources previously untouched, the book presents, undeniably, a phase of Texan, Mexican, and maritime history that merits the favorable judgment of mature scholars. The author should be complimented on the remarkable sketches and diagrams included.

WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR.

Austin, Texas

June 13, 1938

TO THE EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY:

The reviewer is nearly always limited to four hundred to six hundred words. Naturally he can not cover everything included in the scope of Mr. Robinson's letter.

Mr. Hill and Mr. Robinson, apparently, reason that sea power has decisively influenced the course of history, *ergo* sea power decisively influenced the Texas Revolution.

The facts presented by Mr. Hill, as well as those omitted, fail to demonstrate that Mexico was deterred from any undertaking by the existence of the Texas Navy. It is therefore very questionable whether the events and results of the Texas Revolution would have been different had there been no Texas navy. This sentence also states an undemonstrable hypothesis. It has, however, the virtue of being in accord, rather than in conflict, with the facts presented.

HAROLD SCHOEN

Historical News and Notices

Members of the Southern Historical Association are reminded of the fourth annual meeting which will convene in New Orleans, November 3-5, 1938. The Association's Program Committee for 1938 consists of Herbert A. Kellar, chairman, Kathleen Bruce, Richard H. Shryock, Howard K. Beale, and William C. Binkley. Mack Swearingen is chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements for the annual meeting, Walter B. Posey is chairman of the Membership Committee, and A. B. Moore is chairman of the Nominating Committee.

PERSONAL

Frontis W. Johnston, associate professor of history at Davidson College, has been awarded the George Washington Eggleston Historical Prize for 1937-1938 by Yale University for his dissertation on "The Evolution of the American Concept of National Planning, 1865-1917."

The following appointments in the historical guild have come to the *Journal's* attention: B. I. Wiley has been called to the headship of the department of history at the University of Mississippi; his position at Hattiesburg State Teachers College has been filled by the appointment of R. A. McLemore, formerly dean of Judson College; Joseph C. Robert, instructor in history at Ohio State University, has been named assistant professor of history at Duke University; F. H. Allen and Buford Rowland have been appointed classifiers in the division of classification of The National Archives; William Jeffries has been designated instructor in political science at Birmingham-Southern College for the year 1938-1939; Thomas E. LaFargue, fellow of the American Council of Learned Societies at Yale University, has been appointed visiting assistant professor of history at Duke University for the first semester of 1938-1939.

Announcement is made at the University of Virginia of the following promotions: Cary Johnson to be professor and administrative officer of the department; Thomas Perkins Abernethy to be Richmond Alumni professor of history; and Oron James Hale to be associate professor. Professor Richard Heath Dabney has retired after being a member of the history department for forty-nine years.

The following promotions at other institutions may be noted: L. G. Helderman to be professor of history at Washington and Lee University; Charles M. Knapp to be professor of history at the University of Kentucky; Henry H. Simms to be

associate professor of history at Ohio State University; Thomas A. Brady to be associate professor and John B. Wolf assistant professor of history at the University of Missouri.

Summer appointments for 1938 not previously reported: C. C. Pearson of Wake Forest College is teaching at the University of Virginia; S. G. Riley of Meredith College, at the Mars Hill branch of Wake Forest College; Rosser H. Taylor of Furman University, at Wake Forest College; Jack E. Kendrick, at the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina.

Paul H. Clyde of Duke University will be on leave of absence during the first semester of 1938-1939; Howard K. Beale of the University of North Carolina will be absent on leave for the fall quarter, 1938.

On August 1 Philip M. Hamer will assume charge of the division of reference of The National Archives.

Solon J. Buck, director of publications of The National Archives, has been appointed visiting professor of archives administration at Columbia University. He will give a graduate course on "Archives and Historical Manuscripts" at the University on Saturday forenoons and will serve as adviser for students preparing for careers as archivists. A limited number of such students will be given opportunities for advanced study at The National Archives in Washington.

At the University of North Carolina the following fellows in history have been appointed for the session 1938-1939: Alexander H. McLeod, Jr., University of North Carolina; Sidney W. Martin, University of Georgia; and James W. Rabun, Mercer University and University of North Carolina. Miss Elizabeth Taylor, University of Georgia, has been appointed university scholar in history. Miss Ruth Blackwelder, University of North Carolina, James R. Caldwell, Jr., University of Chicago, and William M. Geer, Emory University, have been appointed research fellows in history in the Institute of Research in Social Science.

The Social Science Research Council announces the following Southern grant-in-aid appointees for 1938-1939: Howard K. Beale, professor of history, University of North Carolina, for a study of the life of Theodore Roosevelt; Richmond Croom Beatty, assistant professor of English, Vanderbilt University, for a biography of T. B. Macauley; William Patterson Cumming, professor of English, Davidson College, for a historic-cartographical study of the southeastern region of the United States; Luther Porter Jackson, professor of history, Virginia State College, for a study of slavery in urban Virginia; William Sumner Jenkins, associate professor of political science, University of North Carolina, for a study of the amending processes of the Constitution of the United States; James Cecil Nelson, associate professor of marketing, University of Tennessee, for a study of motor carrier regulation in the state of Tennessee; Benjamin U. Ratchford, pro-

fessor of economics, Duke University, for a study of the debts of the American states; Fritz L. Redlich, professor of economics, Mercer University, for a study of American business leaders; Maurice O. Ross, associate professor of finance, University of Tennessee, for a study of state regulation and control of commercial banking in Tennessee.

In the death of Judge John H. DeWitt of Nashville, Tennessee, on March 7, 1937, the Southern Historical Association lost a distinguished and valuable member. Born in Sumner County, Tennessee, in 1872, he graduated from Vanderbilt University in 1894, and three years later from the law school of George Washington University. He entered at once into the practice of law in Nashville, and throughout the remainder of his life gave unremittingly of his talents and time to the promotion of every cause which in his judgment promised advancement of the public welfare. From 1925 to the time of his death he served as a judge on the Tennessee Court of Appeals, in which capacity he established a reputation as an able jurist. The record of his services to his community and his state constitutes an important part of their history; and at the same time, his own deep interest in the history of his state enabled him to make many scholarly contributions toward the writing of that history. Numerous brief articles and several scholarly monographs by him have thrown new light on the men and the problems of early Tennessee history; at the time of his death he was engaged in the preparation of a history of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, about half of which had been completed and the remainder outlined in tentative form. As president of the Tennessee Historical Society for twenty-five years he played a leading part in promoting the collection and preservation of historical materials concerning the state, and in encouraging others to study those materials. Upon the organization of the Southern Historical Association he immediately manifested an interest in promoting its objectives, and his untimely death deprives that organization of his counsel and support at a time when these would have been invaluable. (By the Committee on Resolutions, W. C. Binkley, Mack Swearingen, and Charles W. Ramsdell.)

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The forty-first annual meeting of the Texas State Historical Association assembled in Austin, April 22-23. At the opening session held Friday afternoon, April 22, the following papers were read: "Administration of the Confederate Sequestration Act," by Thomas R. Havins; "Laredo During the Texas Republic," by Seb S. Wilcox; and "James Long at La Bahía," by Charles W. Ramsdell, Jr. W. E. Wrather, president of the Association, presided at the annual dinner Friday evening, and C. M. Bartholomew presented "Excerpts from a Very Old Texas Diary." At the Saturday morning session, Thomas U. Taylor read a paper on "Jesse Chisholm"; Harold Schoen discussed the "Mexican Cart War"; and R. B. Blake spoke on "Louis (Moses) Rose." The final program, Saturday afternoon,

embraced papers by Jean Shelly Henry, "On the Trail of Andy Adams," and by Robert T. Hill, "Routes of the Coronado Expedition East of the Rio Grande."

The South Carolina Historical Association held its annual meeting in the parish house of the historic Church of Prince George Winyah at Georgetown on April 2. The following papers were read: "The Elliott Society of South Carolina," by Horatio Hughes of the College of Charleston; "Some Early Settlers in Calhoun County," by Mrs. John Bennett of Charleston; "J. D. B. De Bow, Statistician of the Old South," by O. C. Skipper of the Citadel; and "New Viewpoints on Reconstruction in South Carolina," by Francis B. Simkins of the State Teachers College, Farmville, Virginia.

Officers elected for the ensuing year are: James W. Patton, Converse College, president; Charles E. Cauthen, Columbia College, vice president; and Fannie Belle White, Columbia High School, secretary and treasurer.

The Southern Baptist Historical Society has elected the following officers: W. O. Carver, Louisville, president; Rufus W. Weaver, Washington, D. C., vice president; and H. I. Hester, Liberty, Missouri, secretary-treasurer. The above officers with J. E. Dillard, Nashville, and James W. Moffitt, Oklahoma City, were elected members of the executive committee of the Society.

The annual meeting of the Oklahoma Historical Society convened at Northwestern State Teachers College, Tahlequah, May 5-6. The annual address was given by Professor Herbert P. Gambrell of Southern Methodist University.

From September 16-25 Chattanooga will celebrate the seventy-fifth anniversary of the battle of Chickamauga and the centennial of the founding of Chattanooga. Features will be a daily historic pageant, "Drums of Dixie," and a re-enactment of the battle of Chickamauga. President Roosevelt is honorary chairman, and will attend with Mrs. Roosevelt, and speak on September 20.

The following announcement of film loan service of Hayes Memorial Library, Fremont, Ohio, has been made by C. W. Garrison, director of research. It should be of interest to scholars whose field is the aftermath of the War for Southern Independence.

"The final decision in favor of Hayes as president brought local political activities in the Southern states into sharper focus. Some of the battered remnants of the Carpetbaggers and Scalawags entered a despairing plea for Republican supremacy but for the most part tried to deck themselves in the new pattern of reconciliation. Bourbons were skeptical but some praised a policy which delivered to them the goods. Liberal Democrats and conservative patriotic native Republicans dreamed of a new party. Much of this is reflected in the letters to the President, a great deal of it petty wrangling for office with here and there an outstanding thought. It is nearly all illustrative.

"The Hayes Memorial Library has filmed selections from this correspondence

divided for convenience by states. There are available for loan 93 frames on Alabama, 226 on Georgia, 286 on Virginia, and 937 on Louisiana. For the most part they span the period 1876 to 1881. The Virginia film covers some of the Readjuster controversy. The Louisiana film reflects the turbulence of that state in an interesting way and there are included 93 frames of lists of officeholders, appointees, etc., with comments on some of them. For the present this service is supplied without cost. The recipient of course must be near a projector.

"Selections along other lines and of other states will be made if there is a demand. Completeness is not guaranteed but no doubt the most important material referring directly to the question has been filmed. Application can be made to C. W. Garrison, director of research. Problems relating to the location of materials in the United States on the period 1865-1896 in public and private possession, and on Ohio for the period 1840-1896, will be taken up in conjunction with the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, by arrangement with Dr. Harlow Lindley, secretary, editor, and librarian."

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

The Struggle Over Slavery (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938, viii, 84 pp., \$.40), by Robert B. Weaver, "is a story of early slavery in America, the contests over the growth of slavery, the secession movement, the Civil War, and the rebuilding of the South." It consists mainly of long quotations from contemporary sources, although brief editorial and explanatory comment is inserted.

Negro Year Book: An Annual Encyclopedia of the Negro, 1937-1938 (Tuskegee Institute: Negro Year Book Publishing Company, 1937, xvi, 575 pp., \$2.00), edited by Monroe N. Work, is a useful reference work upon the status and achievements of the Negro race. While the Negro in Latin America, Europe, and Africa is considered, the major portion of the volume is a compendium of data upon the Negro in the United States. There are divisions devoted to the Negro's position in national recovery, agriculture, labor, business, governmental affairs, race relations, crime, education, religion, and military history. A special section considers the Negro in poetry and fine arts, another the literature on the Negro, and a final section is a directory of newspapers, organizations, and social service centers.

The Louisiana State University Department of Archives has issued *Calendars of Manuscript Collections in Louisiana, No. 1, Taber Collection* (University, La., 1938, 12 pp.). This is a calendar of nineteen Civil War letters of Fred R. Taber, a private in the Confederate army. It was prepared by the Historical Records Survey.

Preliminary Notes on the Caddoan Family, by Paul Weer, has been issued by the Indiana Historical Society (*Prehistory Research Series*, Vol. I, No. 4, March, 1938). The study concerns three Caddoan-speaking groups, the Arikara of

North Dakota, the Pawnee of Nebraska, and the Caddo proper and related tribes living in Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Mississippi, A Guide to the Magnolia State (New York: The Viking Press, 1938, xxiv, 545 pp., \$2.50), compiled and written by the Federal Writers' Project of the WPA, is a volume in the *American Guide Series* which, when completed, will include all of the states, many communities, and several of the dependencies of the United States. Essentially designed for the tourist, the volume will also serve as a handbook. There are brief sections devoted to white and black folkways, archeology and Indians, religious and educational development, agricultural, industrial, and commercial progress, and literary, musical, and architectural contributions. The *Guide* is profusely illustrated.

The Episcopal Church Among the Negroes of Virginia (Richmond: Virginia Diocesan Library, 1937, 26 pp.), by G. MacLaren Brydon, is a chronological treatment of the subject with emphasis on the period from 1865 to the present. The study shows that in 1936 there were in the two Virginia dioceses 16 active Negro clergymen, 42 congregations, and 2,619 communicants. It includes a discussion of the two significant educational institutions, the Bishop Payne Divinity School at Petersburg and the St. Paul's Normal and Industrial School at Lawrenceville.

Wilberforce, an Experiment in the Colonization of Freed Negroes in Upper Canada, by F. Landon, is reprinted from the Royal Society of Canada, *Transactions*, Ser. III, Sec. 2, Vol. XXXI (1937), pp. 69-78. The Wilberforce settlement owed its origin to a group of Cincinnati free Negroes who were virtually expelled in 1829 as a result of anti-Negro riots. The colony eventually numbered about 150 inhabitants, and all but a few family heads had acquired land by 1832. "As a colonization project, Wilberforce may be said to have ended by the year 1835, but as a Negro settlement it continued until quite recent times."

North Carolina Social Science Maps and a *Teacher's Manual* of thirty-seven pages have been prepared by A. R. Newsome of the University of North Carolina and published by the Denoyer-Geppert Company, Chicago. The ten classroom wall maps, embracing fifty-two separate maps, insets, and charts, are entitled *Exploration and Settlement, Indians and Whites, Independence and Union, Plantation Times, The War for Southern Independence, Agriculture, Industry, Population, Political and Education*, and *Physical*.

The Mississippi Department of Archives and History announces the following acquisitions: 25 miscellaneous manuscripts, 1812-1906, from the office of the secretary of state; several copies each of various numbers of the *Daily Bulletin*, issued by the *Clarion-Ledger* office during the yellow fever epidemic of 1897; 34 pieces, letters and other manuscripts, 1902-1903, assembled by W. Calvin Wells for use in writing a history of the Twenty-second Regiment of Mississippi

Infantry, C. S. A.; a collection of scrapbooks, pictures, diaries, and several hundred letters of Charles W. Buck, United States minister to Peru, 1885-1889; and John C. Burrus Collection, 1832-1915, of diaries, miscellaneous manuscripts, and several thousand letters, given by Mrs. Maggie Barry of Benoit, Mississippi.

Recent accessions to the collections of the North Carolina Historical Commission include: photostats of 22 North Carolina maps, 1780-1890; a number of Civil War pamphlets; 251 manuscript volumes, consisting of the leaf tobacco book of M. H. Pinnix and Company, place of business unknown; and day books, ledgers, and other account books of the following general merchants: R. L. Davis and Brothers, Farmville; Dildy and Agnew, Wilson; Willis Edmundson, Wilson; Howard-Williams Company, Wilson; and P. L. Woodard Company, Wilson.

The University of Kentucky Library has acquired the records of the Bank of Kentucky, 1806-1840. A specific appropriation has been made by the general assembly to increase the research materials in the University library.

Manuscript collections recently acquired by the Louisiana State University Department of Archives cover the period from 1750 to 1930 and contain approximately 6,230 pieces. Among them are the Amiss Collection from the Baton Rouge district, 488 pieces (1770-1917); the diary of Harod C. Anderson of Haywood County, Tennessee, 3 volumes (1854-1888); the Assumption Parish Collection, 50 items (1841-1914), records of several families of the locality; the collections of David French Boyd and Thomas Duckett Boyd, former presidents of Louisiana State University, 80 items (1874-1922); the College of the City of Baton Rouge Collection, 4 volumes (1837-1841); the Citizens Bank of Louisiana Collection, 11 items (1851-1855); the journals, letter books, ledgers, and diaries of James P. Corbin of Moss Point plantation, Caroline County, Virginia, 19 volumes (1826-1924); the plantation journals, cash books, travel accounts, 6 volumes, and 113 unbound items (1856-1880), of Stephen Duncan of Natchez; the Farr Collection, 92 items (1862-1896), containing information on the Jenkins and Dunbar families of Natchez; the Favrot Collection, 148 items (1758-1920), letters relating mainly to the southern part of Louisiana; Civil War and other letters, 19 pieces (1863-1870), in the J. D. Garland Collection; diary of Kate Garland, Petersburg, Virginia, 26 items (1859-1870); the Lilian Gray Collection, 5 volumes and 174 other items (1860-1916), including Louisiana plantation account books; the Koch Collection from Logtown, Mississippi, 3,100 items (1820-1900), including plantation documents, travel accounts, material on the Civil War and Reconstruction in Mississippi, and the lumbering business; Civil War and Reconstruction plantation records in the Jean Baptiste Landry Collection, Assumption Parish, 148 items (1838-1887); the Montpelier Academy Collection of St. Helena Parish, 58 items (1833-1840); the papers of Thomas O. Moore, Civil War governor of Louisiana, 632 items (1832-1877); the Port of New Orleans Papers, 3 pieces (1816-1819); papers of the New Orleans

Academy of Science, 7 items (1852-1870) ; 33 additional items (1838-1870) to the John G. Palfrey Collection, concerning the Palfrey plantation in South Louisiana; the John Reid Collection, 45 items (1861-1870), valuable for Civil War commissary records; records of Red Lick plantation in Mississippi, 2 volumes (1885-1894), in the E. B. Ross Collection; the Daniel D. Slousan Collection, Port Hudson, Louisiana, 537 items (1852-1878), valuable for information regarding medical care of soldiers during the Civil War; papers of the Louisiana Sugar Planters Association, 200 items (1907-1908) ; the St. Mary Parish Collection, 23 items (1862-1865), including the records of several individuals from that parish; the Charles Taylor Collection, 12 pieces (1848), containing information on Silliman College, Clinton, Louisiana; a portion of the papers of Robert Clay Wickliff, congressman from Louisiana, 76 items (1897-1914). The Department has also acquired the official records of Caddo Parish, 182,820 items (1838-1893) ; Catahoula Parish, 51,180 items (1810-1911) ; East Feliciana Parish, 561,800 items (1811-1931) ; and St. John the Baptist Parish, 39,570 items (1812-1924).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Where 'The Captain' Was Found," by Anna H. Findlay, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).
- "The White Servants at 'Northampton,' 1772-74," by William D. Hoyt, Jr., *ibid.*
- "The Annacostin Indian Fort," by William B. Marye, *ibid.*
- "Forgotten Scientists in Old Virginia," by Richard Beale Davis, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).
- "Dewesville and Providence," by Hattie Belle Gresham, *ibid.*
- "Sir William Berkeley, Virginian Economist," by Harold Lee Hitchens, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (April).
- "The Henkels, Early Printers in New Market, Virginia, with a Bibliography," by Albert Sydney Edmonds, *ibid.*
- "Notes on the Use of Pewter in Virginia during the Seventeenth Century," by Worth Bailey, *ibid.*
- "Three Generations of Kentucky Lincolns," by Louis A. Warren, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (April).
- "Elizabethtown, Kentucky, 1779-1879, The First Century of Its Existence," by R. Gerald McMurtry, *ibid.*
- "Spanish Louisiana and the West: The Economic Significance of the Ste. Genevieve District," by J. Manuel Espinosa, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (April).
- "The Evolution of a Frontier Society in Missouri, 1815-1828," Part I, by Hattie M. Anderson, *ibid.*
- "The Preservation and Dissemination of Missouri History," by E. M. Violette, *ibid.*

- "Housing in Creole St. Louis, 1764-1821: An example of Cultural Change," by Marshall Smelser, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "Eastern Cherokee Chiefs," by John P. Brown, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (March).
- "How the Cherokees Acquired and Disposed of the Outlet," Part IV, by Berlin B. Chapman, *ibid.*
- "A Brief History of the Red River Country Since 1803," by Emma Estill-Harbour, *ibid.*
- "From Parker to Poe, Being a Brief Sketch of the Early Judiciary of Tulsa County," by John Bartlett Meserve, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Letters between the English and American Branches of the Tilghman Family, 1697-1764," edited by Harrison Tilghman, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).
- "Baltimore County Land Records of 1685," contributed by Louis Dow Scisco, *ibid.*
- "Notes on Baltimore County Land Records," by M. L. Radoff, *ibid.*
- "Letters of Charles Carroll, Barrister," continued, *ibid.*
- "Letters from Old Trunks," continued, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).
- "Notes from the Records of Stafford County, Virginia, Order Books," continued, *ibid.*
- "Boyhood Memories of Dr. James Craik, D.D., L.L.D.," contributed by Mary Craik Morris, *ibid.*
- "Diary of Col. William Bolling of Bolling Hall," continued, *ibid.*
- "Maps of the First Survey of the Potomac River, 1736-1737," by James W. Foster, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (April).
- "Letters of Richard A. Wise, A Student at William and Mary College, 1860, and 1861," *ibid.*
- "A Visit to Mount Vernon—A Letter of Mrs. Edward Carrington to Her Sister, Mrs. George Fisher," *ibid.*
- "Quit Rent Roll for the Year 1715—Essex County, Virginia," contributed by John B. C. Nicklin, *ibid.*
- "Petersburg Jockey Club Book, 1785," *ibid.*
- "Inventory of Halcott Pride's Estate in Dinwiddie County," *ibid.*
- "The Letters of Hubbard Taylor to President James Madison," edited by James A. Padgett, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (April).
- "Kentucky Marriages and Obituaries, 1787-1860," compiled by G. Glenn Clift, *ibid.*
- "Letters of George Caleb Bingham to James S. Rollins," Part III, edited by C. B. Rollins, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (April).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Ben Tillman Disfranchised the Negro," by William Alexander Mabry, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (April).
- "Acadien Transients in South Carolina," by Ruth Allison Hudnut and Hayes Baker-Crothers, in the *American Historical Review* (April).
- "Castle Pinckney, Silent Sentinel of Charleston Harbor," continued, by Rogers W. Young, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April).
- "Governor Drayton's Contribution to Geography," by Ralph H. Brown, *ibid.*
- "U. S. S. Peacock in the War of 1812: A Fight Off the Florida Coast," by T. Frederick Davis, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "The St. Joseph Convention: The Making of Florida's First Constitution," III, continued, by F. W. Hoskins, *ibid.*
- "Georgia's Board of Public Works, 1817-1826," by Fletcher M. Green, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June).
- "Francis Orray Ticknor," by Sarah Cheney, *ibid.*
- "The Mercantile System as Applied to Georgia," by Reba C. Strickland, *ibid.*
- "Napoleon's Cession of Louisiana: A Suggestion," by Richard R. Stenberg, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "A Consequence of the Louisiana Purchase," by Lauro A. de Rojas, *ibid.*
- "Sir Walter Scott in New Orleans, 1818-1832," by Harold F. Bogner, *ibid.*
- "James Ryder Randall in Louisiana," by John Earle Uhler, *ibid.*
- "The New Orleans General Strike of 1892," by Roger Wallace Shugg, *ibid.*
- "Santa Anna's Lost Dictatorship, 1853-1855," by Richard A. Johnson, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "Analysis of the Work of the General Council of Texas, 1835-1836," by Ralph W. Steen, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Gaillard Notes," compiled by Mabel L. Webber, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April).
- "DuPre Records," contributed by A. S. Salley, *ibid.*
- "The Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1765-1775," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, *ibid.*
- "The Panton, Leslie Papers: Letters of Edmund Doyle, Trader, 1808-1814," in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1784-1800," VI, continued, edited and translated by D. C. Corbitt, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (March); VII, continued, *ibid.* (June).
- "Old Canoochee Backwoods Sketches," I, continued, by Julia E. Horn, *ibid.* (March); II, continued, *ibid.* (June).

- "Diary of George Bell, A Record of Captivity in a Federal Military Prison, 1862," edited by Whitfield J. Bell, *ibid.* (June).
- "Mississippi River Ice at New Orleans," by John C. L. Andreassen, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "The Difficulties of Andrew Jackson in New Orleans including his later dispute with Fulwar Skipwith, as shown by the Documents," edited by James A. Padgett, *ibid.*
- "The First Synagogue in Louisiana," by Leo Shpall, *ibid.*
- "Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana," LXXV, continued, translated by Heloise H. Cruzat, marginal notes by Henry P. Dart, revised by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*
- "Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana," LVII, continued, edited by Laura L. Porteous, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*
- "The Mezquía Diary of the Alarcon Expedition into Texas, 1718," translated and edited by Fritz L. Hoffman, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "President Jackson and Anthony Butler," edited by Richard R. Stenberg, in the *Southwest Review* (Sumner).

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES AND COMPILATIONS

- "The Course of the South to Secession," VI, concluded, by Ulrich B. Phillips, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (March).
- "Indiana Republicans and the Re-election of President Lincoln," by Winfred A. Harkison, in the *Indiana Magazine of History* (March).
- "Prock's Letters to the Vincennes Western Sun," *ibid.*
- "With Grant at Vicksburg—From the Civil War Diary of Captain Charles E. Wilcox," edited by Edgar L. Erickson, in the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (January).
- "Early Literature of Tobacco," by George Arents, Jr., in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (April).
- "Was There Danger of a Second Civil War During Reconstruction?" by William A. Russ, Jr., in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (June).
- "The Historic Civilization of the South," by Ulrich B. Phillips, in *Agricultural History* (April).
- "A St. Croix Map of 1766: With a Note on its Significance in West Indian Plantation Economy," by Waldemar Westergaard, in the *Journal of Negro History* (April).
- "Rebels and Agrarians All: Studies in One-Party Politics," by Rupert B. Vance, in the *Southern Review* (Summer).

CONTRIBUTORS

WILLIAM O. LYNCH is professor of history at Indiana University.

ALLEN MOGER is assistant professor of history at Washington and Lee University.

WILLIAM ALEXANDER MABRY is instructor in history at Duke University.

RICHARD R. STENBERG is at present doing research and writing in Southwestern history at the University of Texas.

LILLIAN A. KIBLER teaches history in the college department of Ward Belmont School.

J. G. DEROULHAC HAMILTON is Kenan professor of American history and political science and director of the Southern Collection at the University of North Carolina.

HORACE ADAMS is chairman of the Division of Social Science at Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS

ISAAC FRANKLIN: SLAVE TRADER AND PLANTER OF THE OLD SOUTH

BY WENDELL HOLMES STEPHENSON

A biographical study of a prominent slave trader and Southern planter. Documentary supplements illustrate the economy of the large slaveholding plantation.

368 pp. Cloth. \$3.00

MY DRIFT INTO RURAL SOCIOLOGY

BY CHARLES JOSIAH GALPIN

Memoirs of a social pioneer "based upon the author's experience with rural life and thought in America and Europe."

151 pp. Cloth. \$1.00

FOR FALL PUBLICATION

HOW THE OTHER HALF LIVED IN OLD NEW ORLEANS

EDITED BY E. MERTON COULTER

Sketches of characters and incidents from the Recorder's Court in the 1840's.

*Order from your bookseller
or direct from*

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
UNIVERSITY, LOUISIANA

THE EAST TENNESSEE HISTORICAL SOCIETY'S PUBLICATIONS

*Published annually by the
East Tennessee Historical Society, Knoxville*

Some Contents of Current Issue (No. 10) Ready August, 1938

Public Career of George Washington Campbell, by W. T. Jordan

Felix Grundy and Depression of 1819 in Tennessee, by J. H. Parks

John Mitchel, Irish Patriot, Resident of Tennessee, by S. C. Williams

Early Press of Jonesboro, by Paul M. Fink

Tennessee and the Union, 1847-1861, by Mary R. Campbell

Farmers' Alliance and People's Party in Tennessee, by J. A. Sharp

Letters from John Rhea to Jefferson and Madison, by J. A. Padgett

*Papers from the Spanish Archives relating to the Old Southwest,
1783-1800, II, 1786*, by D. C. and Roberta Corbitt

Writings on Tennessee History, 1937, by Laura Luttrell

Managing Editor, S. J. FOLMSBEE, University of Tennessee.
Copies of previous issues containing numerous significant contributions to the history of the South available at \$2.00 each.

Annual Membership dues, including Annual *Publications*, \$2.00

Write the Secretary,

LAURA LUTTRELL, LAWSON MCGHEE LIBRARY, KNOXVILLE